



Division

PURITAN COLLECTION

Section

SCC
9126



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/apology00monr>



A N.

A P O L O G Y

FOR THE

Clergy of Scotland,

Chiefly oppos'd to the

Censures, Calumnies, and Accusations

OF A L A T E

Presbyterian Vindicator,

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

WHEREIN

His Vanity, Partiality and Sophistry
are modestly Reproved,

And the Legal Establishment of Episcopacy in that
Kingdom, from the Beginning of the Reformation,
is made evident from History and the Records of
Parliament.

Together with

A POSTSCRIPT, relating to a Scandalous Pamphlet,
Intituled, *An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence.*

Quibus ego non sum tantum honorem habiturus, ut ad ea quae dixerint, certo loco, aut singulatim unicuique respondeam. Sic breviter, quoniam non consulto, sed casu, in eorum mentionem incidi, quasi praeteriens satisfaciam universis.

M. T. C. Orat. in Q. Cæcilium.

Scottish Church Tract—An Apology for the
Clergy of Scotland, chiefly opposed to the
Censures, Calumnies, and Accusations of a
late Presbyterian Vindicator, together with a
Postscript relating to a Scandalous Pamphlet,
intituled "An Answer to the Scotch Presby-
terian Eloquence," 4to, 108 pp., 4s 6d 1693

APOL
Clergy of Scotland
Presbyterian Vindicator
An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence
1693

THE

CONTENTS.

A Short Introduction	Page 1, 2
The Division	p. 2
<i>The first Plea discuss'd, and the Cameronians prov'd not only to be Presbyterians, but the only true Presbyterians</i>	p. 2, 3, 4, 5
<i>The Villanies committed to be the result of an Uniform Combination, and wicked Principles, and not the transient efforts of Passion</i>	p. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
<i>The second Plea of an Interregnum expos'd</i>	p. 10
<i>The third Plea, that the People were injur'd by the Clergy disprov'd</i>	p. 11, 12, 13
<i>The fourth Plea, from the Immoralities of the Clergy, Confuted and Retorted</i>	p. 14, 15, 16
<i>The fifth Plea against the Clergy from their want of Popular Election, unreasonable in it self, and retorted upon the Adversary</i>	p. 16, 17
<i>The sixth Plea, that the Clergy peevishly and rigorously pressed Conformity, examin'd</i>	ibid.
<i>The seventh Plea against the Clergy, that they are Heterodox, found to be vain, foolish, and frivolous</i>	p. 18
<i>The eighth Plea, that they are Enemies to K. William and Q. Mary considered</i>	p. 19
<i>The ninth, that they Preached Non-Resistance, and Passive Obedience. This Doctrine proved to be still reasonable and Christian</i>	p. 20
<i>The tenth Plea against the Clergy, that the Episcopal Church is remiss in Censuring scandalous Delinquents, baffled and rejected</i>	p. 22

The Contents.

<i>The second General Head, a Modest Censure of the Vindicator taken from his own Book.</i>	p. 23
<i>First, His avowed Partiality and Injustice</i>	ibid.
<i>Secondly, His peremptory and Enthusiastick pretences to a Jus Divinum</i>	p. 24
<i>Thirdly, His rudeness and vanity</i>	p. 25
<i>Fourthly, His Tergiversations and Lying</i>	p. 26
<i>Fifthly, His illnated and uncharitable Insinuations</i>	p. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31
<i>The third General Head. His Theological Reasonings, &c.</i>	p. 38
<i>First, Of the Observation of Christmas, and the Festivities of the Church</i>	p. 39, 40, 41, 42
<i>Secondly, His Notion of Schism</i>	p. 43, 44, 45, 46
<i>Thirdly, His Censure of the Clergy for Preaching Morality</i>	p. 47, 48, 49, 50
<i>Fourthly, His Notion of Calvinism, and his way of explaining, and defending it</i>	p. 51, 52
<i>Fifthly, His pretences to Antiquity, and the History of the Culdees</i>	p. 53, 54, 55
<i>Sixthly, His Clamour against Ceremonies of human Institution</i>	p. 56
<i>The fourth General Head, wherein the Legal Establishment of Episcopacy in Scotland, is proved from the Records of Parliament</i>	p. 60, 61, 62, 63, 64
<i>The Conclusion in several instances from the foresaid History</i>	p. 66
<i>The Protestation in the year 1651. against the General Assembly</i>	p. 79
<i>Postscript, Relating to a Scandalous Pamphlet, Entituled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence</i>	p. 85, 86, &c.

A N

A P O L O G Y

F O R T H E

Clergy of *Scotland*, &c.

S I R,

YOUR Friendship for me I look upon as a great Honor, and I value my self upon it; and the sincerity, wherewith I endeavour to serve you, prompts me more to undertake what you command, than any sense I can have of my own Skill or Ability: and rather than oblige you to continue your importunities, I send you here my thoughts of that Book you ordered me to Read. I undertook it with great aversion; partly because such scurrilous Contentions are very Unchristian in the first Original, scandalous in their Consequences, and very unedifying to the Christian Church. Partly, Because I think the late Presbyterian Barbarities and Cruelties towards the Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland* are sufficiently known all *Europe* over, and therefore I was unwilling to undergo the Penance of reading a Book, that provoked me in every other Line unto the undecencies of Passion. It lay by me six months without ever opening it, until I was over-powered by your Commands. Though, in the mean time I must tell you that you never imposed a severer Task upon me. I have no inclination to Read such Books, no more than I have to drink off a Potion of Physick every day to my Breakfast: besides there are some men with whose Genius I am not well acquainted, who cannot be silenced because they have made lies their Refuge. The Truth, it self (if at any time it happen'd to be on their side,) doth not please them unless it be dressed up in all the Colours of Falshood, and stript of its natural Beauty and Simplicity; who like *Solomon's* Whore, when they have but newly committed their Abominations, desie all mankind to charge them with the least Transgression. Men who Arm themselves with all degrees of Confidence to run

B

down

down the clearest Truths that truly represent or seem to disparage the *Faction* in which they are engaged. If that Book of which you desire my Thoughts were particularly answered, such a Reply could not but swell to a prodigious Bulk, because to clear the Matter of Fact in so many particular Cases, obliges men to turn over all the Pamphlets to which his Book is related. I did indeed once Read his Book that he Entitles his *Second Vindication*, and I hope I shall never be so destitute of good Books (though at present I have very few) as to peruse it a second time. However I will briefly give you my thoughts of it, and since the Book has no method, I may be allowed to put the Reflections I make upon it in any order I please.

In the first place I will examine his General Apologies by which he thinks to ward off the blame of the barbarous *Rabblings* of the Clergy from his Party. Secondly, From the Book it self, I'll give you a natural Character of the Author. Thirdly, I will shortly consider his Theological Reasonings, that occasionally falls under his consideration, when he pleads for the Innocence of Presbyterians. And lastly, I will consider the truth of that ordinary Objection that the Presbyterians manage against the Episcopal Church of *Scotland*, when they alledge that Presbyterian Government was established in that Church from the beginning of the Reformation.

And first, I take notice that all along he seems to disown the *Cameronians* as Presbyterians, or as men not of their *Communim*. At other times he acknowledges they are zealous *godly* men, and if he proves that the Barbarities committed upon the Clergy were not committed by *sober* and *intelligent* Presbyterians, he thinks the Presbyterians are sufficiently vindicated from all imputations of Cruelty and Violence. And therefore unless we prove them *sober* and *intelligent*, he thinks all our Complaints of the Outrage and Tumults of the Presbyterians are *vain* and *impertinent*: But are not the *Cameronians* Presbyterians? To what Communion then do they belong? Have they any Principles, Discipline, or Worship, different from the Presbyterians? Were not their Leading Men lately owned and received by the pretended General Assembly, without retracting any Articles of Doctrine, or disowning any of their Practices that they so zealously recommended to their Followers in the West? This is a very pleasant Fancy, that the Author should endeavor to hide the Tumults and Insurrections of that Party by changing the name of Presbyterian into *Cameronian*. The *Donatists* in *Africk* (as readily all Schismaticks do) split themselves into two great Factions, *viz.* The *Primianists* and the *Maximianists*. What Sacrilegious Villanies they committed (and all under the Pretext of Zeal and Reformation) every body knows. But pray? What an impertinent Apology could it have been for the *Donatists* to say that it was true indeed there were a great many Barbarities committed upon the Clergy, their Families, Churches, Altars, and Sacred Utensils; and upon the People adhering to their

Vide Optatum,
Milevit.

their Communion, but that such Indignities were not committed by the *sober intelligent Donatists*, they intended no more than the Reformation of Abuses by orderly and *Imperial Edicts*. Their Zeal against the *Traditores* only put them upon extraordinary attempts of Reformation. It could not be denied, but that the *African Church* and the *Catholick Clergy* there were sadly oppress'd and run down by a company of mad and ungovernable Enthusiasts; but the *sober and intlligent Donatists* were not to be blamed. They were either the *Primianists*, or the *Maximianists*, that committed such Extravagancies, and disorders, or (which is most probable) they were committed by the *Circumcellians*, a third Division of that unhappy Family.

Now the Author makes just such another Apology for the *Presbyterians of Scotland*. He cannot deny but that the *Orthodox Clergy* in the *Western Shires* were miserably harass'd, but the *sober and intelligent Presbyterians* are not to be blamed. We do easily grant him that the *Presbyterians* that were most instrumental in the *Disasters* of the *Clergy* were not *sober men*, though the most *intelligent* amongst them did contrive and manage the *irregular Heats and Motions* of their own *Partizans*.

But to expose the vanity of this Apology a little more closely. We know no Opinions that *Mr. Cameron* propagated or entertained that were *peculiar* to himself. He followed most closely and ingenuously the *Hypothesis* of the old and zealous *Presbyterians*; and the plain Truth is, *Mr. Cameron* was not a man very proper to be the *Founder* of a new *Sect*. He built upon the *Notions* that he was taught by his *Brethren*: and the *Presbyterians* are oblig'd for this word *Cameronian* to the *Episcopal Clergy*, who mean no more by this word but a *Presbyterian whose Zeal for his Faction* (after the Example of *Mr. Cameron*) *over drives him violently beyond all Bounds of discretion*. And yet I cannot but commend their *Artifice* in this. The word *Presbyterian* is known in *England*, but the word *Cameronian* is not; and therefore this distinction (for distinctions are of great use sometimes) of *Presbyterian* and *Cameronian* is a very plausible *Defence* in *England* to disprove all the complaints made by the *Episcopal Clergy*. As if the *Cameronians* were a new *Species of Schismaticks* different from the *Presbyterians*, and that we had three considerable divisions of *Christians* in *Scotland*, the *Episcopal Party*, the *Presbyterians* and the *Cameronians*. Whereas indeed, we know of none but two. And the *Cameronians* are those *Presbyterians* that have study'd their own *Principles* most accurately, and draw from those *Principles* such *practical Conclusions* as they *naturally and necessarily* yield. I know not how this Author can make his *Peace* with the *Cameronians*. For the whole *Nation* knows that those *Presbyterians* whom he *Nicknames Cameronians* did assert their *Presbyterian Principles* when others were very silent; and upon this they value themselves as the most *Pious, Active, and ingenuous* of the whole *Party*, who differ not from others in their *Principles* but do exceed some of their *Brethren* in

higher degrees of *Zeal* and *Sincerity* to promote the *Interest* of their Combination. But pray? What is it that the *Cameronians* have done that they might not have done upon *Presbyterian Principles*? For it is a received Maxim amongst them *That the people may, (especially in Conjunction with their Pastors) reform the Church when the Magistrate is slack or remiss in his duty, or opposite unto the designed Reformation.* Now the removal of the *Episcopal Clergy* upon their *Hypothesis* was a necessary mean to advance this glorious Reformation. And what is there in the most Barbarous Rabbling of the Clergy inconsistent with the *Presbyterian Principles*? Can *Religion* prosper in our Nation unless the *Bishops* and their *Adherents* be extirpated? And is not *Presbyterian Government* the *immediate* and *express Institution* of our Lord and Saviour? Is not the exercise of *Presbyterian Discipline* the *Administration* of his Royal Kingdom and Scepter. And may we be less serious in asserting his *Kingly Office* than in defending his *Priestly* and *Prophetical Office*? Did not the *Presbyterian Church* of *Scotland* upon all Turns wrestle with Authority about this great *Truth*? And does the Author think that they ought not to interpose in so Critical a Juncture to rescue themselves from the Bondage of the *Antichristian Hierarchy*? That their *Squeamish Consciences* groan'd under for so many years? If the Reformation of the Church from *Episcopacy* to *Presbytery* be of this Consequence (As they Print and Preach every where.) What is there in those last *Tumultuous Rabbings* that the *Presbyterians* can disown? Wherein are the *Cameronians* to be blamed? Because forsooth this Author thinks that the *Actors* of those *Villanies* we complain of were perhaps not so *sober* and *intelligent*, that is to say, he rejoyc'd in what was done, but he wished it might have been carry'd on with greater caution and secrecy, lest the *Episcopal Clergy* might take occasion to represent them and their proceedings in their true and natural Colours.

I think the Author is to blame for saying the *Cammeronians* are not *intelligent*. For certainly they took their Measures by the best directions that could be had; for their Agents gave them exact intelligence of what they might venture upon and when. Accordingly a company of wicked Incendiaries (who had declared War against King *Charles* the Second, when he Governed the Nation by those Laws that were made in times of Peace by the most unanimous and solemn Parliaments that ever the Nation had, and who declared in their Seditious Pamphlets and Papers that he had forfeited all Right to the Crown, because forsooth, he had broke the Covenant) I say they, were the men who at the beginning of this Revolution (as they were directed) fell violently upon the Clergy and drove them from their Houses and Residence; to the scandal of *Christianity*, and reproach of our Nation. And this is not at all to be imputed to the casual efforts of Passion or Revenge, but to an uniform Combination of the whole Society: and this appears, because the Clergy were not generally Rabbled by their own Parishioners,

but by those Fire-brands who concerted their Measures with their own Societies, and did nothing of that Nature without Advice and Directions. The Author thinks to excuse what was done against the Clergy, when he tells us in some places of his Book, that their own Parishioners gave them no disturbance: but this proves that the Cruelties they met with proceeded from a League and Covenant amongst their Enemies since those mischiefs did not light upon a few of the Clergy (who might possibly provoke their Parishioners by some indiscretions) but upon the whole Order, even upon such, (who mistaking the true Objects of Pity and Compassion) as had frequently interposed with their Superiors to mitigate the Legal Penalties against Non-Conformists. Add to this that severals of the Gentry in the West, who were better natur'd and had better Principles than their Presbyterian Neighbours, were very forward to resent the Affronts, and Indignities done to the Clergy, until they understood that the Tide was risen too high to be resisted: and that such of the Presbyterians as were then out of the Nation, and directed the Methods that the Rabblers were to take, would vigorously resent the least stop that was put to their career. For it is observable of such men that they never forgive an Injury; and no Injuries are more implacably resented than any the least Affront that is offer'd to their Faction and Government. And it is no wonder for they never say the Lords Prayer, and it is probable that their opposition to that Divine Composure, is rather from its contradiction to their Nature, than from the strength of some whistling *Entusiastick* Arguments invented against it. It is not possible to oblige men of their Tempers by any Favours, and the Clergy upon the last Revolution found such of them as they had done kindness to, most *uno nous* and *irreconcilable*: and generally the Body of the People in those Western Shires are *cunning*, *avaritious*, and *dissembling* beyond measure: and since the Presbyterian Principles invaded their Honesty, it was never heard that any of them heartily forgave an Injury, or what they fancied to be so.

But I return to what I intended, *viz.* That the Affronts done to the Clergy were concerted by the Party: since it is evident from many of their Topicks and their avowed Principles, that there was nothing so rude or villanous in the disasters that the Clergy met with but what they might venture upon by the *Maxims* of their *Moral Theology*; so also it appears undeniably from this, that the Leading Men of that Party who were at London upon the beginning of the Revolution, opposed with all Vigour and Impudence all the *Evidences* brought from Scotland of the Sufferings of the Clergy. And though a Reverend person brought with him Authentick Attestations of what the Clergy suffered; yet the leading Presbyterians boldly averred, that there was nothing in Scotland but profound Peace and Silence; that

The Confederacies against the Government were then called Societies in the West of Scotland.

they had Letters from their *Factors* and *Chamberlains* informing the contrary to what was alledged by the *Episcopal* Party.

In the *Confusion* that Affairs then stood, it was eafie for them to stop any *regular* or *legal* Tryal; and they had in that *critical* Juncture many Advantages of their Neighbours. So their Emissaries in

Fusque datum
sceleri — Scotland went on with all possible *Licence* and *Villany*.

And it is very odd that this Author should undertake to vindicate the *Presbyterians* from those Tumults, when the united force of the whole Party, with all their Zeal and Strength, never yet appeared so unanimous and uniform in any enterprize as at that time in their endeavours to pull down our National Church, and so fond were they then of their Revenge, that they preferred their *Dagon* of *Presbytery* to their being United to *England*. The Author thinks that neither he nor his Party are obliged to vindicate any act of Cruelty that proceeded from the Civil Authority against the Clergy. If they were the Patrons of *Presbytery* (as he thanks God they were) certainly their Actings ought to have been justified in the first place, but he tells us that if the Clergy have suffered any thing that was hard and extraordinary, it ought not to be imputed to his Party and Principles, but to the King and the Council, and the Rabble, as he very mannerly expresses himself. Yet I must thank him for this commendious Apology, since the *Presbyterians* under the late Reigns suffered nothing but what was *inflicted* by Law. We need make no excuses for the Laws made against *Presbyterians*, and those Laws more gravely consulted, than the hasty and undigested resolutions of peevish and angry Outlaws. And such Laws were made in times of Peace, and with all *Solemnity* and *Deliberation*, and were absolutely necessary to maintain the Peace of the Nation, and the Kings legal and just Prerogative against the *Popular* but *pernicious* Tenets of bigotted Covenanters; now I hope you are sufficiently convinced that I need not transcribe the *History* of the Tragical Rebellion in King *Charles* the First his time, nor yet the many Protestations of the Covenanters at the Cross at *Edenburgh* against the Kings most Just and Fatherly Proceedings. And to convince you by one Instance that they love nothing but what they possess by Force and Rebellion. When that most gracious King ordered the Covenant to be taken as it was Enacted in King *James* the Sixth his time (thinking this might blunt the edge of the Covenanters, and satisfy the deluded People) they Protest against this his Proclamation. For you must think that in their Divinity, things *Lawful* in their Nature, nay things Necessary, (for such they take the Covenant to be) become *unlawful* when once required by

Vid. Kings large
Manifesto.

lawful Authority. Does this Author think that the present Generation knows nothing of the History of *Presbyterians*? That the *British* Tragedies from the year 1638. are buried in eternal silence? That all the *Monuments* of their daring Insolence are

extinct?

extinct? That the Acts of the *General Assembly* are quite lost? That the Villanies of the *Remonstrators* are Recorded no where? Why then does he think to impose upon the World by telling us that indeed they are very sorry for the Tumults that happened in the *West*, but that the *Presbyterians* were no Actors in those disorders. They would gladly see things done more regularly and orderly; They (forsooth) love no such Methods: and yet the present Ministers of the *Presbyterian Church* cannot instance any one thing that the *Cameronians* did upon this late *Revolution*, but what is justifiable from *Presbyterian Principles*; and though they could not be justified from their former Principles, why may not the present *Presbyterians* improve the Principles of their *Predecessors**? As all Sectaries do who grow worse and worse until they are given up of God unto a *Reprobate mind*. And indeed if I had any Books by me I could easily prove (especially from their own *Calderwood*) that the *Presbyterians* did nothing towards the Clergy in the *West of Scotland* upon the late *Revolution*, but what they ought to have done upon their Principles and former Practices. It is very pleasant to observe what different Batteries the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, and the *Dissenters* in *England* raise against *Episcopacy*. The *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* plead for their *National, Classical, Spiritual Power*, independent upon Kings: the *Dissenters* in *England* plead that such a *Spiritual Union* amongst Clergy-Men is too powerful a Faction, and may easily endanger the *Safety and Peace* of the Nation. The Reason is, the *Presbyterians* are in possession of such an Union in *Scotland*, and the *Dissenters* in *England* have no legal Cement to unite them together. And therefore every thing that they are not in Possession of at present, is wicked and dangerous: but if they could grasp it, it might become a very useful Engine to Propagate the *Covenant* all *Europe* over. For they find that men are naturally averse to the *Power and Authority* of their *Discipline*, and therefore it were necessary to support it by all the strength of *Laws and Edicts*, and by the *Inquisition* it self, if the Eyes of Princes could be so far opened as to see that there is no true *Reformation* wrought but by the *Conduct and direction* of *Presbyterians*. I have insisted the longer upon this general Topick because most of his Book is built upon this *Subterfuge* alone, that *Cameronians are no Presbyterians*, though they can be reduced to no other *Schismatics*; and that what they did was disowned by the *Presbyterians* though he himself knows the contrary, and the whole Party magnified these Heroes; and when it was doing it was said to be nothing less than the Cause and Work of God.

* Who of the old *Presbyterians* ever Preached against the use of the *Lords Prayer* or *Doxology*?

Letters of a *Dissenter* to the truly Learned *Dr. Burrough*.

But I leave this general Head when I give you an account of one remarkable piece of *Sophistry* and *tergiversation*, that he makes use of to palliate the Crimes of his Party; and it is so much the more material, since if he fails

in this he shakes the Foundation of all his Apologies, by which he would make us believe that the *wise and leading Men* of his Party had no hand

Pag. 35. Eden-
burgh Edition.

in any Tumults, no not in that at *Edinburgh* in Decem-
ber 1688. His words are, *For the Tumults at Edinburgh,*
we know of none but what was made by the Students at the

College there in burning the Pope in Effigy. And a little after, *That any Pres-
byterians who then or since had Authority in the State or Church did assist in
contrivance or management of this matter we do utterly deny.* I have faithfully
transcribed his own words, because this is a considerable passage which lies
in the Face of all Evidence, and contradicts the Conviction of all the In-
habitants at *Edinburgh*. Then, if the barbarous Tumult at *Edinburgh* was
managed and contrived by the Leading Men of his Party, who *then and
since* have had Authority in the *State*, in that case all his Apologies for the
Presbyterians fall to the ground. And from this one single Instance his

*Crimine ab uno
dise omnes.*

Book is ruin'd and his Authority baffled, and the next
General Assembly will order him to be more *cautious,*
and quietly tell him, it had been better he had not ven-
tured upon this *unfortunate* Sally against his Adversaries. For there is

nothing more easily made out than that the Leading Men of the Presbyte-
rians were the sole *Actors and Contrivers* of this hideous *Tumult*. To make
you sensible of this, let me observe *first*, That he *shuffles and confounds* two
very different *Stories* into one, *viz.* The Tumultuous defacing of the
Kings Chappel, and the burning of the Pope in Effigy: for the last was
near a fortnight after the other without any *Tumult or disorder*. The
Students had made a mock *Effigies* of the Pope, and carryed it from the
place that it was made to the Colledge, and from thence to the Cross at
Edinburgh. All of them in the mean time walking orderly in their Ranks,
and the Colledge *Mace* carryed before them by one of the Publick Ser-
vants, this could not be obtained without the *Masters Permission*. So
there was no *Tumult nor no disorder* intended: A great many of the
Nobility, and most of the *Citizens* of best quality were looking on, and
when this foolish *Ceremony* was over, they retired to their Lodgings with-
out any *Tumult or Extravagance*. But the defacing the Chappel at *Holy-
rude House* was a *Tumult* indeed, and a very *tragical* one too, in all its
beginnings and Consequences. This fell out upon the 10. day of *December,*
1688. The Presbyterian Faction in *Edinburgh*, had sometime before deter-
mined to Rifle the Kings House, particularly my *Lord Chancellor's*
Lodgings, to deface the *Chappel*, and to force the *Guards*, and in a word, to
make the most *terrible* and the most *numerous* shew that they were able to
make. In order to this they gave out that the *Papists* intended a *Massa-
cre* of the *Protestants*, though there was not a *Papist* in *Edinburgh* to two
thousand *Protestants*: And in the Confusion that Men were then in, a
great many unwary people were frighted, and the Presbyterians *concert-*

ed their Measures and flew to their Arms, and the City for that night become a dismal *habitation*, carrying all the marks of *Hell* and *Confusion*; nothing was to be heard but screeches, lamentable *howlings* and *shootings*, and this was not managed by the Body of the People (who were very averse to such treacherous and unmanly adventures) but by some of the Leading Presbyterians, who *then* and *now* have Authority in the State, and might be known by their large *Buff-Belt*, and a *Halbard* upon their Shoulder, running up and down in great fury to excite the People to this *Reformation*. In this Scuffle, before they entred the Chappel, there were some killed, and several wounded by the Guards that kept the *King's House*, and in the mean time the *Governours* of this Tumult finding that the People were not so forward to Pillage the *King's House*, went up and down and told them that their own Children were killed, when those very Children were at Home and safe in their Lodgings. And though many were wounded, and severals killed, yet not a Student belonging to the College was hurt, for there were but very few of them whose Youth and Levity had engaged them to be witnesses of this Tumult.

I believe the Ringleaders of the Presbyterians at *Edenburgh* will give the *Vindicator* but little thanks for mentioning this Tumult that is openly avowed by themselves. And he may ask, not only the forementioned Gentleman, but also the Master of *F—* and several others (whose names are concealed, and may continue so, unless the *Vindicator*, or some of his *Associates*, by their *indiscretions* oblige me to be more particular) whether they were *there*, and what a glorious *Figure* they made. If it be unpleasant to name particular Gentlemen, they may thank their *Vindicator* who obtrudes such *fulsome* Lies upon the World, when the Matter of Fact is so very recent, and known to all the Inhabitants at *Edenburgh*; and the Leading *Presbyterians* are very loth to part with the honor of this Achievement, so agreeable to their constant *Genius* and former *Practises*; for one of their chief Advocates pleaded lately before the Judges, in the Tryal of *Mr. Wallace*, that they that Pillaged the Kings House were a *Company of Grave, Reasonable, Thinking Men, Commanded by a Lord of the Sessions*. We see then by this one single Instance the Spirit of Lies and Vanity that runs through his Book. For if it be undeniable that this Rabble Reformation was *concerted* by the *Ringleaders* of the Faction. Then he must own that the Tumults were not the *accidental Efforts* of some angry inconsiderable People but the *united* endeavours of the Presbyterians.

And indeed this Essay at *Edenburgh* was but the Preface to other marks of the Kindness they intended the Clergy in that place; if their violence had not been happily prevented by the Generous Resolution of that *Learned* and *Illustrious* Society of the College of Justice: and it is very probable that the *Vindicator* wrote down this Story carelessly and hand over head. For if he had advised with his Friends at *Edenburgh*, *George Stirling* the Apothecary, and *Mr. Menzies* in the *Locken bushes*: they could not be so self-denied

The very next Lords day one of their Ministers in the Meeting-House belonging to the Tron Church Parish, December 17. thanked God for this Glorious Reformation, I instance him not to exclude others, but because I can prove it.

as to be willingly deprived of the honour they had in managing and contriving this Tumult. It was a disparagement to their Zeal, and Activity, to be robbed of the Glory they acquired in this Enterprize. I cannot but acknowledge that it is highly indecent to name particular Men, but what shall we say when we have to do with such *Wasps* and *Hornets*: you see then by the Reflections I have made of this General Topick, what the Superstructure must be.

The next thing under which he endeavours to cover himself and his Party, is his fancy of an *Interregnum*. He tells us gravely in many places of his Book, that what was done against the Clergy was done in an *Interregnum*, and that the People were highly provoked by the Clergy, that they were instrumental in the Sufferings of the Non-Conformists. That the Clergy themselves were but *profligate* and *debauched*, and that they are generally such as are unacquainted with the operation of the Spirit of God upon their Hearts; and if this does not excuse, yet it extenuates what those zealous Patriots did at that time to advance the *Glorious Reformation*.

I cannot but take notice in the first place of his wild imagination of an *Interregnum*, which cannot properly fall out in an *Hereditary Monarchy*; for the King never dies. For, Though the *Laws* were not put in Execution in that Interval of *Confusion* and *uncertainty*, yet they retained their *Legal Force* and *Authority*. The Government was indeed in a *Convulsive Motion*, so that it could not perform the *ordinary Functions* of Order and Justice; but does he think, that because humane *Laws* were in that *Interval* hindered, that therefore the *Godly* and *Zealous* Presbyterians were loosed from the Obligations of the *Laws* of Nature and Religion? Is there no security against the *violent hands* of those *Saints*, but the *coercive power* of *Laws*? How can they pretend to be better Christians than the rest of their Neighbours when they venture upon the most *unbritian* Practices? Which puts me in mind of the Character that *Cornelius Tacitus* gives of the *Jews*, *They were kind and affectionate to their own Kindred, but they retained adversus omnes alios hostile odium*. *Juvenal* gives the same Character of them, but it is much more agreeable to the *Presbyterians*. Does he think that the Notion of an *Interregnum* can justify what modest Men are ashamed to own?

And is it for the honour of his Party that he should proclaim to the World that they stand not in awe of the *Divine Laws*, unless they are restrained by the terror of *Humane Laws*? Why do they pretend to be acquainted with the *Gospel*, when they openly and jointly condemn its most *essential Precepts*? But he says the People were much injured and provoked by the Clergy. What the Clergy in the West of *Scotland* did,

I know

I know not, if I make an estimate of their proceedings against *Non-Conformists*, from the practice of our Clergy-Men in other parts of the Nation, I declare sincerely to you I never knew one of them that prosecuted the *Dissenters* without great reluctance, nay I knew many of them that interposed with sincere kindness and vigor for their Parishioners, frequently and with success too, when they were obnoxious to the *Laws*.

But let us suppose that the Clergy did prosecute the Dissenters according to Law, they did nothing in this but what they were obliged to do, the *Peace* of the Nation was *indangered*, the *Legal* and *Lineal* Monarchy was undermined; and the Government, by such frequent *shakings*, most likely to relapse into its former *state of Civil War* and *Confusion*; and the souls of the People committed to their Care were poisoned with *dark* and *Entusiastick* Principles: *Speaking evil of Dignities* took place of the *Ten Commandments*, and a Schism unreasonable in its beginnings, and disowned by all Protestant Churches, and the *learnedest Presbyterians**, was propagated in all corners of the Nation with all vigor and diligence; and ought the Clergy to look on and continue idle Spectators when the Peace and Safety of their Country *Spiritual* and *Temporal* was so daringly and *factionously* invaded? Were they not obliged by the *Laws of God* and *Man* to stop this *Career* of Insolence and Villany, and though they ought to undeceive the poor deluded People by all the soft Methods of tenderness and meekness, yet the *Boutefeu's* and *Incendiaries* were to be chastised and *lashed* with greater severities, and our Governours did nothing then but what they ought to have done in their own defence, unless they had resolved to Sacrifice the *Fundamental Constitution* of the *Monarchy* and their own *Honours*, *Dignities*, and *Estates* unto the *Caprice* and *Ambition* of some bigotted *Covenanters*.

* Bochart. Phaleg. Edit. 3. Lugd. Batav. pag. 989. *Ca- vendum igitur ne Scyllæ fugâ in hanc Charybdim incidamus, neve rigor nimius, & plusquam Varinianum in Episcopos odium, eo imprudentes adigat, ut Veteri Ecclesie dicam scribamus, & ab ejus communi- one ipsi nos arceamus. A quibus Extremis Gallicanas Ecclesias semper abhorruisse libri à Gallis scripti palam indicant, & Nostrorum perpetua praxis.*

Idemibid. *Interim Episcopale regimen esse antiquissimum, & paulo post Apostolos per Universam Ecclesiam magno cum fructu obrinuisse, est mihi compertissimum.*

But I would ask the *Vindicator* whether they of the Clergy that never prosecuted any of the Dissenters were the more kindly treated upon this last *Revolution*. I know severals of them who have been most spitefully used by the Pre-byterians, though formerly they did them all the good Offices that lay in their power. The Clergy, as well as the Laity, were obliged by the *Laws* of the Land, and by the *Fundamental Laws* of *Humane Society*, to crush, and extirpate the beginnings of *Rebellion*, and the attempts of such as preached the most pernicious Principles, until at last the *Rebels* justified in their Books and Sermons open and *avowed Murthers*. And that by the most natural Consequences from their own

Principles, when the wickedness of the Party appeared thus terrible to the Peace of the Nation, was it to be expected that our Governours should look on and suffer their own *Throats* to be cut, their *Families* to be forfeited, their *King* to be dethroned, their *Church Polity* to be pulled down, and the entire *Scheme* of their Government to be defaced? And all this for no other Reason, and upon no wiser Consideration, than because their Enemies *pretended* Religion, and gave most *sacred* Names to the most *abominable* Crimes. And now again that they are uppermost, they are very angry that men do not shut their Eyes, and suffer their Follies and Tyranny to overspread the Nation without Contradiction. But what was it, that *their* Ministers did suffer upon the Restitution of King *Charles* the Second. Why they would not take *Presentations* from the Patron, nor *Collation* from the Bishop: they would possess their Benefices against the Law, and in defiance of Authority: but was any of them turned out that did comply with the Law? So earnest

were some of our Ecclesiastical Governours to keep them in their Places, that they made such offers of Peace and Accommodation, as none could refuse but *sullen* and *desperate* Incendiaries, nor was there anything required of them, but what the most rigid Presbyterians might comply with, if their Zeal to support their Faction had not infatuated them as much against the Vow of Baptism, as against the common Peace and Safety of their Country.

The Presbyterians in *Scotland* are generally blinded with this *fatal* prejudice (an Evidence of their incurable Enthusiasm) they think that no man can act any thing against the *Presbyterians*, but he immediately acts against the light of his own Conscience. They take it for granted that their *way* is the only true Religion, that it is *plainly* revealed, and that they give greater Evidences of *Piety*, and *Religion*, than any other Society of Christians upon Earth, and if you do not believe this presently, without Examination, you are far from the *Kingdom of God*. Nay, you are *alienated from the life of God*. Hence it is that the *Presbyterians* conclude that whatever is done against their Party, is done rather against the Light and Conviction of their Enemies, than the petulance and vanity of their *own* Fraternity: therefore they insinuate upon all occasions, that all Reasonings against them proceed from Prophanity and Atheism, or from men void of all *Principles* and Religion. You may as easily reason a *Bedlamite* out of his fancied Honors and Principalities, as persuade any of their deluded Disciples that they may be in an Error: and this they owe to their *cunning* Teachers, who tyrannize over their *Belief* as imperiously as the cruel *Brach-mans* do among the *Indians*.

But let me enquire in the next place calmly, did the meek *Covenanters* when they got the ascendent in King *Charles* the First his time, treat their Opposite with that *gentleness* and *discretion*, that *condescension* and *longanimity*, that became the true Gospel of our Saviour? But so very far from this temper, that they prosecuted the *Malignants* with all

Rage and Cruelty. And if there were not another instance of their Cruelty, but the Sufferings of the excellent *Bishop Wisbart*, men might easily penetrate into the *Genius and Spirit* of the Party. Then their Pulpits thundered against the *Malignants* all the *Curses* in the Bible; and all were *Malignants*, in their Dialect, that were not *Presbyterians*. Add to this the universal and restless endeavours of their Ministers to ruin the *Persons, Estates, and Families*, of all that opposed their *Designs*: and their Discipline was made an Engine to pry into the greatest Secrets of Families, and the Presbyterian Chaplain, who was ordinarily the Ministers Intelligencer, complained in his Prayers of what he thought amiss in the Family or Neighbourhood, nay the Soundest part of the Nation groaned under this Tyrannical *Pedantry*, as the *Israelites* did under the *Egyptians*, when their bloody Scaffolds stood erected for some whole weeks together. Then it was, that their modest Ministers said that *their Cause* was like to prosper, when they justified one Crime by the Commission of another, and the whole *Scheme* of their Arbitrary Tyranny from their Success and Prosperity; when their *Turkish* Argument of Force and Arms ran down the Doctrines of our *Meek and Crucified Saviour*. And now forsooth they must tell us, that the Episcopal Clergy were *rigid*, and *peevish*, and severe, to their Parishioners; when perhaps they did not represent to the Judges, in their several bounds, the tenth part of those Crimes that were committed against the Church and State; and yet the Law did oblige them to give up the names of Recufants. And do not we see, that the Presbyterians since the late *Revolution* have out done the diligence of all men against the Clergy and Laity of the Episcopal persuasion, for the whole Faction applyed their utmost force (since the *Revolution*) to ruin her Neighbours, and possess themselves of all their Places, *Civil, Military, and Ecclesiastical*.

The truth is, there are no people upon Earth that value Government and Sovereignty as the Presbyterians do. It is the Idol they bow to: there is nothing gratifies their highest Passions so much as a power to tyrannize. If the whole world were once under their Feet, they would look chearful, their Blood would *Circulate* more *briskly*; untill this be obtained there is no rest nor peace for mankind. The *Discipline, the Sacred Discipline of Geneva*, must wrestle with all Authority until the Consumation of all things.

But if the former excuse did not serve his *Design*; yet it is often insinuated all a long his Book that most of the Clergy were *wicked men*. But let me suppose the truth of this *infamous* accusation; who made *them* Judges of the *Scandalous* Clergy? Whose Delegates were they in the Execution of this Punishment? I have told you before that I am acquainted with very few of the Clergy of the Western Shires, but I am informed by judicious and intelligent Men, that generally the Clergy in those Shires were *Grave, Sober, and Assiduous* in the work of the Ministry. That most of them endeavoured

deavoured upon all occasions to gain those *Enthusiasts* from their *Schism* and *Delusion*, and were very successful in this Christian design, if a new *Indulgence* after the Defeat at *Bothwell-Bridge* had not buoyed up their *Interest*. As for the *scandalous* Aspersions cast upon the Clergy by the Western *Presbyterians*; it is certain that by one of the *Vindicators* own *Rules* we ought not to believe them; because they are all of them of a *Party*, and indeed of such a *Party*, who from their first appearance in the *World* placed much of their strength in reproaching the *Clergy*. If some of the *Ministers* in the *West* did not live according to the *Dignity* of their *Character*, we ought rather all of us (who have not renounced our *Baptism*) to lament it, rather than insult and upbraid them with it. Indeed a *Minister*, whose *Employment* is to fit other men for *Eternal Life*, and yet lives in open and scandalous opposition to his *Rule*, is the most *monstrous* thing in *Nature*. All the *Satyrical* Writings of the *Poets*, and all the *Invectives* of *Orators*, cannot furnish one word to give a true *Idea* of that loathsome *Creature*. But on the other hand, If any of them be guilty, to upbraid them with their faults, is not the way to reform them, for of all *Advices* those that are given to reform the *Clergy*, should be managed most nicely and tenderly. And it is to be feared that the *Vindicator* and his *Associates* are very glad when they can discover the trippings of their *Adversaries*. If any of the *Clergy* be guilty of such things as are clamorously alledged by *Presbyterians*; it is no *Argument* against the common *Cause* of the *Catholic Church*, and the *Apostolical* Succession of that *Hierarchy* of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, continued from the days of the *Apostles* until now. And therefore he may, if he will (as is threatned) employ the people in the *West* to make and gather stories to the disadvantage of the *Episcopal Clergy*, and it is an easie thing to swell that *Volumn* into a prodigious *Bulk*, if their ignorant and implacable *Enemies* may be believed, it is not possible for them not to accuse. But I think the *Vindicator* himself, is not of so *profligate* a *Conscience* as to give *Ear* to such *malicious* *Reports*. We have had late *Instances* of the *Presbyterian* activity against the *Reputation* of the *Clergy*, no man could escape a *Libel* that enjoyed a *comfortable* *Benefice*. Nothing could have made the *Presbyterians* more contemptible than this *treacherous* and *sneaking* method of

The Presbyterians in England libelled all kind of Crimes against the Clergy before the Rump Parliament, and one of them was deprived for drunkenness, who was so abstemious, that he never drank any thing in his life but Milk and Water.

Libelling, when it was visible to all men that those *scurrilous* *Papers* were intended for no more, than to ruin and disgrace the most *innocent* and *deserving* men. And it is very odd that they could venture to blindfold the *Nation* by this *baffled* and *hypocritical* *Sham*, and how comes it that the *Clergy* in the *West* are represented as *Criminals*, when they dare not attack the *Clergy* in the *North*? The reason is obvious, the *People* in the *West*

date their *Conversion* from the time that they forbear to hear the *Curates*, and they think themselves obliged by all their ties and solemn *Covenants*, to ruin and disparage those *limbs* of *Antichrist*. But the People in the North can discover no such beauty in their *Presbyterian Discipline*: they love and honour their own *Ministers*, they hear them Preach the *Articles of Christian Faith*, and true and solid *Morals*, and so rough are those *Infidels* in the North, that they never thought *Sniveling* necessary to make a *great Saint*. They love a plain and unaffected *Stile*, and they cannot be persuaded but that the *Oracles of God* may be Preached without *affection*, and yet with all requisite *Gravity* and *Recollecion*.

If there be so many *Libels* gathered by *Presbyterians*, it may provoke their *Enemies* to recriminate, and if the *Vindicator* thinks that such *scurrilous* writings can serve the common cause of *Religion*, I wish him more wisdom and sobriety: I condemn all *such* methods in all *Parties*, and if the thing were allowable, we could tell him that many of his *Associates* in the *Ministry* are very *scandalous*, some of them *Adulterers*, some *Fornicators*, some *Blasphemers*; some whole *Presbyterian Families* *Incestuous*,

— Sed præstat motos componere fluctus.

If I rejoiced in this *Recrimination*, I were not a good *Christian*. But it is necessary to put those *Proud* and *Supercilious* men in mind, that they are but ordinary *Mortals*, encompassed about with the same *Infirmities* with other men, and that they should consult the *Scriptures*, and the *Fathers* for *Arguments*, rather than the *Cameronian Zealots*, in the *Western Shires*; and if they beat the *Clergy* at those *Weapons*, they deserve to be chastised; and for a conclusion to this *Observation*, I must tell you that I know not a more *unblamable* Company of men upon *Earth* than the *Episcopal Clergy* of *Scotland*. Nor do I know any five of them in the whole *Nation*, who could not undergo the severest *Examinations*, used in the *Christian Church* *Preparatory* to *Ordination*. I wish that they may make a *Christian use* of their present *Tryals*, and give the world a proof of that greatness of soul that qualifies men for the *Priesthood*; that all round about them may be convinced that he that is in

them is greater than he that is in the *World*. Seneca John Ep. tells us that to do good even when it is attended with infamy, is noble and heroic: and a greater than Seneca tells us, that we must go through good report and bad report; God will clear our *Innocence*: as the Sun in his *Meridian Elevation*, and I hope to the *Conviction* of our *Enemies*, that in the *simplicity* of our souls we designed the *Reformation* of sinners, and that we look upon our selves as *Dedicated* to the *immediate Service* of God; and the sooner we retire into our own *Consciences*, and discover the *secret Springs* of our present *Calamity*, the sooner will our heavenly Father remove the marks of his *Indignation*. There is no Argument so proper to convince the *Ignorance* of *foolish* men as by well doing; and though we

shoul

should not be so successful in gaining *Profelites* in the midst of a crooked and perverse Generation, yet we fortifie the Peace and Tranquillity of our Consciences, we strengthen our selves against those things that are most terrible to Flesh and Blood, we rejoyce with joy unspeakable and full of Glory, in the midst of all Calamities and Reproaches that are cast upon us. And let not them that are yet untouched think that their Brethren, upon whom the Tower of *Siloam* fell, are greater sinners than their Neighbors.

I leave this, and I go forward to another Topick by which he endeavours to vindicate the Presbyterians; and it is this that the Clergy of the Church of *Scotland* did press the Consciences of the Presbyterians; and that the People could not own them as their Ministers, because they were obruded upon them, and not invited by *Popular Elections*. But the *Vindicator* should consider,

Vid. pag. 52. and pag. 87.

that if his Argument be turn'd against his Party in the North of *Scotland*, it may be of dangerous Consequence to the growth of *Presbytery*. For the Presbyterians there are not likely to carry their Elections by plurality of Votes; but does not he remember that severals of the Remonstrator Presbyterians have been inducted to their Churches by some Troops of *English Horse* in the time of the late Civil Wars, yet he does not think but that

the People owed all *Deference* and *Spiritual Obedience* to them; and if a * *Pastoral Relation* may be founded between a Minister and the People by *Cromwells Troopers*, why not by King *Charles the Second's Dragoons*? But does not the *Vindicator* remember that some have been obruded on the *old College of Aberdeen*, without the *Regular* and *Collegiate Election*, by the same very force that had planted some Remonstrator Ministers, and that without any *Tryal* or *Examination*, when their more deserving *Predecessors* were most *Tyrannically* removed.

* His own word.

But not to trifle with the *Vindicator*, The method of admitting Ministers in the Church of *Scotland*, under the *Episcopal Constitution*, is the most just, and the most *unexceptionable* that can be devised. For

Vid. Letters of the Persecution.

when the *Candidate* for any Ecclesiastical Preferment receives a *Presentation* from the Patron, he goes to the *Bishop*, and the *Bishop* sends him to the *Presbytery* to undergoe the ordinary tryals of his *Literature* and *Sufficiency*; and when the *Bishop* and his *Presbyters* with him are satisfied of his *Knowledge* and *Learning*, then the *Bishop* serves a publick Edict at the Church where the *Candidate* is to be preferred, inviting all the *Parishioners* to come to the *Cathedral Church* against an appointed day, to see if they have any *reasonable* exception against the *Candidate*; and this is not done in a *burry*, but they have a competent time allowed them to gather all possible *Informations* concerning him from all *Quarters*; and if they can object any thing against him that is of any weight, they are heard and the *Candidate* is repulsed: now I would gladly know what is it that the People

can complain of in this Ecclesiastical Polity? The Confusions of Elections that are solely left to the People are innumerable, and though we had not famous and remarkable Instances in Ecclesiastical History of the bloody and tragical Effects of such popular Elections, our own Country might furnish us with very many sad Experiments, when the Parishoners could not compromise the affair peaceably, they quickly came to Blowes, and in many places to Bloodshed, and Riots. These were all the good effects we could discern of their popular Elections; it cannot be denied, but that the method of electing the Clergy varied often and appeared under many Figures in several Ages, and Countries, since the first Plantations of Christianity: but I dare boldly say no Christian Church came nearer the Apostolical Method, and more happily avoided both Extremes, than the Church of Scotland under the Episcopal Constitution. But you may put the Vindicator in mind that the Presbyterians themselves never thought the Call of the People so essential a Constitution of that Pastoral Relation. For there is an Act of the General Assembly, ordering the Presbytery to name a Minister to such Parishes as were Malignant, that is, such as were of the Episcopal persuasion, so this pretended popular Election, if at any time it prove unserviceable to advance their Tyranny, is immediately rejected. For the Presbyterians do not at all believe any such inherent Right in the People to chuse their own Ministers; for they think the Malignants have no Right to chuse for themselves, this is the sole privilege of the Godly. The Malignants are not at all to be consulted, accordingly we see that though their Parliament lodged the power of Election in the Heretors and Elders of each Parish, or in the major part of them, yet no Elections are allowed by the Presbyteries, though never so unanimous and universal, but such as are promoted by their own Factious, witness *Musselburgh* and *Tranent*.

Damasus and Ursinicus at Rome, Vid. etiam Ammianum Marcellinum.

Wherever they dare venture, they have no regard to the popular Call, as lately appeared at Leith, the unanimous popular Election of Mr. George Gray was refused, and one Wishart a Presbyterian thrust upon them.

There is hardly any thing insisted upon by the Presbyterians more foolish and inconsistent with common honesty than this Topick from popular Elections, and to say the truth, the old Presbyterians never obtruded such a whimsy upon the People: the Lay Patronages were not abolished in Scotland until the year 49. when the Discipline was in its Zenith when there was no sin Preached against but *Malignancy*, and the Kings Prerogative Royal was possessed by the Kirk. Presbyterians in other Countries quietly submit to Lay Patrons: and indeed if the Bishops take care that none but pious and vertuous Men be Ordained, what harm can the Church sustain by such Presentations. May not the Clergy examine such Candidates as offer themselves to the Ministry, accurately and narrowly? 'Tis certain that

the most trifling and superficial Students do most effectually recommend themselves to the People, nay there are so many mean and abject Arts requisite to promote a Clergy-Man (if the Hypothesis of the popular Election hold necessary) that an ingenuous man cannot prostitute himself to such servile and popular methods. As for the grave and retired Clergy-Man, he is sure never to be preferred; and if some judicious and discreet Patron does not force him out of his Solitude, he is like to die amongst his Books, and the Church has been served in all Ages to the best Advantages by such as least understood the Arts of *Insinuation*, and it will continue so until the end of all things.

In the next place I do not see why the Vindicator should say that the Clergy pressed the Consciences of their Hearers: there was nothing in our worship, but the use of the Lords Prayer, the Doxology, and the Apostolick Creed at Baptism, that they themselves objected against, are not these mighty Grievances to Tender Consciences? The Vindicator tells us that Presbyterians were not against the use of those Forms, but they would not use them as the Prelatists did. What he means by this I cannot tell; but I can tell you that all the Presbyterians before the year 1638. made use of them all. And that after the year 38. until Cromwell's Army invaded our Nation they never left off the using of those Catholick and Christian Forms. But such of the Remonstrators as were deeply in the Interests of the *Usurper*, then left off the use of such Forms, drawing as near as was possible to the Spiritual Heights, and pretended Purity of the Independents in the Army. And the Christian Religion at that time in our Nation varied in its outward Figure, and in their Notions about it as much as the Philosophy of the Schools, and the wise Questions of *Universale* and *Objectum Attributionis logicæ*. The Vindicator is content to use such Forms, but not as the Episcopal Church doth command it. That is to say, he will do nothing in Unity and Society with the Christian Church, and though the Vow of Baptism oblige us, as we are Members of Christs Mystical Body, to preserve and support the Unity of the Christian Church, yet he thinks he may leave the Communion the Church, without either fear or scruple, in those very things that are short Abstracts of our Faith, and Symbols of our Profession. And yet no People are now so violent as they in pressing Subscriptions to the Presbyterian Confession at Westminster, and that without any ex-

Vid. Presbyterian Inquisition of the College of Edinburgh.

ception, restriction, or explication, I am of Opinion that the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland have been from their Infancy taught in, (and are firmly resolved to adhere to) the Protestant Religion, and is it not a piece of extra-

ordinary vanity in the Presbyterians to insinuate that they themselves are the only men careful to preserve the purity of Doctrine? Did not the Clergy that addressed to the pretended General Assembly, plainly declare that they would subscribe the Westminster Confession, as it contained the

Funda-

Fundamentals of Protestant Religion. But this the *Vindicator* thinks did not sufficiently purge them from the suspicion of being *Arminians*. There are but very few of the Clergy of *Scotland* that explain the Doctrine of *Grace* and *Freewill* after the method of *Arminius*; and if any of them does not favor the *Calvinian Hypothesis* they are very far from propagating their Opinions in a factious manner, and not at all enclined to change the *Pulpit* into a *Metaphysical Chair*. I think it is no disparagement to either of the Parties to say that every one of them cannot state such controversial differences fairly, and reason about them closely; nor is it necessary for every Country Minister to read *Alvarez* and *Dr. Tuisse*, *Arminius* and *Episcopius*. Those questions have been debated in all Ages of the *Church*, and if we understand so little of our selves, of our own soul, and its union with the body, the method and manner of its operations. How daring a thing is it to pretend to grasp the infinite Mind that made Heaven and Earth, and to methodize the Acts of that eternal Intellect, in whom we live, move, and have our Being? To read some of the School men is enough to make a modest man tremble, when he considers that the incomprehensible Deity is thought to be fettered by the Laws, Methods, and confused Notions of our Mind, this is learned Ignorance, and the *Presbyterians* may think they wonderfully reform the World when they oblige Ministers to Swear their Systems of *Metaphysics*. It were infinitely better to leave them to their Liberty in things that are disputable in their Nature, and pass finding out after all our Endeavours. Upon the whole matter, the Objections against the Clergy from the Doctrine they Preach is vain and trifling, and serves no other Design than to fill the Mouths of the People with words that they do not understand, and yet have a mischievous influence upon their lives.

Acts 17.

Another Topick by which he endeavours to provoke the present Powers against the Episcopal Clergy, is, that they are Enemies to King *William* and Queen *Mary*.

Page 24. Edinb. Edit.

I have no Commission to give an account of particular mens Opinions in the Controversie that is now debated in *Britain*, but I may observe that the *Vindicator* puts a mean Complement upon King *William*,

Page ibid. Edinb. Edit.

to tell the World in Print that the Interest of King *William*, and that of the *Presbyterians* is embarked together; i. e. If King *William* does not punctually observe the *Original Contract*, they know well enough what they owe all earthly Kings. Again he tells us, that such of the Episcopal Clergy as addressed to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, never thought of any such Addresse, until they had lost all hopes of King *James*; and by this he thinks to disparage the Episcopal Clergy wonderfully: whereas the Argument rightly turn'd is to their Advantage. That they never treacherously

For they fancy the Covenant to be the tenure by which any King may hold his Crown.

betrayed King *James* when they were publickly Praying for him, nor did they secretly *undermine* his Government when they were giving *publick thanks* for his Administrations, as the *Presbyterians* did, and such of the *Episcopal Clergy* as came over to King *William*, ought to be treated with Civility and Protection at least, if it were no more but that their Principles of Government are more agreeable to Reason, and more favourable to Monarchy in General, and the Common Peace of Mankind. I know no

* *And therefore K. William having not taken the Covenant; and being in League with bigot Papists, and still Protecting the Church of England and its Hierarchy, should be Excommunicated upon Presbyterian Principles, as at Sanghair lately it was reasoned and determined, the 10th. of August.*

Notion the *Presbyterians* can have of a King, but that he should be * *Arch-Bedle* to the *Kirk*, and that he ought to employ his Power and Authority to execute their Decrees. The *Vindicator* remembers no doubt the Act of the *West Kirk*. A Specimen of Presbyterian Loyalty to *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, we have lately from the *Provost of Rutherglin*, who publickly owned that they would indeed Arm so many Forces, and not Disband them until *K. William* had Established *Presbytery* to their mind; and if he did not so settle it, they would turn him out, and use him as they did *K. Charles the First*. But if the *Episcopal Clergy* in the *West of Scotland* are enemies to the present Government, they are obliged to continue in that opposition by the *Vindicators* Principles, so unfortunate is he in his Endeavours to serve the present Government. For if the Clergy in those Shires never met with any thing but Acts of *Hostility*, without any *Law; Tryal*, or so much as any the least *Formality* of Justice; pray, let the *Vindicator* tell me what *Allegiance* do they owe upon such Principles, as he and his Associates were wont to propagate under the Reign of *K. Charles the Second*? And therefore he himself (not others) deserves to have his *Neck stretch'd* for adhering to such Principles, as necessarily overthrow in their last consequence all Government and Order.

Another Topick upon which he and others found many of their Libels against the Clergy, is, that they were subservient in the late Reigns to advance Arbitrary Power by their Doctrine of

— *Nunquamne reponam.
Vexatus toties.* —

Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience. The *Episcopal Clergy* Preached no Doctrine but the true Christian Doctrine, which can never be overthrown by all the Attempts of their Adversaries; they Preached indeed that in every Government there was a Supreme Legal Tribunal, from whose Decisions there lay no Appeal upon Earth. That this Supreme Tribunal was not at all to be resisted, and therefore that the *Insurrections* in the Western Shires against the King, Parliament, and Laws was Rebellion, in its most rigorous Notion: this indeed they did Preach, and I hope they are not yet so degenerate as to think or Preach otherwise: as for the other Branch of the Controversie,

verſie, whether the King of *Scots* may be reſiſted, I will tell the *Vindicator* my Opinion when he and I ſtands upon a Level. For where the Supreme Tribunal may be reſiſted, and counter acted, then there is ſomething higher than what is already granted to be *Supreme*; but the King and Parliament are with us *Supreme*, and if they may be reſiſted, what is it that may not be reſiſted? If Sentences interfere, there can be no Government, becauſe no final Decision of *Controverſies*; therefore there can be no Appeal from the Supreme Tribunal in any Nation; and into whatever Figure the Government is molded, ſome ſuch *Supreme Independent Tribunal* muſt be acknowledged, whence there is no Appeal, and of which there is no reſiſting; unleſs you ſo order your Government as to have one part of it fight perpetually againſt the other, and in that caſe our *Saviour* tells us, *That a Houſe divided againſt it ſelf cannot ſtand*. And do the *Presbyterians* think to recommend themſelves by aſſerting ſuch Doctrines as neceſſarily overthrow all Government? And blowes up the Foundations of all Humane Society? We have all the Governments in the World to defend us upon this Head; for without this neceſſary truth no Notion can be formed of what is *Law, Government, or Society*; do not we ſee every day ſuch as oppoſed the Government, any where, Fined, Conſined, or Executed? And this carries with it the Unanimous Sentence of all Judges upon Earth, declaring that the Government is not to be Reſiſted in its firſt and Supreme Authority: neither ought the Secrets of Government to be ſo prophaned, as to be laid open to the Cenſure and Objections of every petulant Meddler. It is not our buſineſs, who live in private Stations, to Canvaſs the Myſteries of State; God ordinarily gives to ſuch as are at the Helm of Government another Spirit, than that he beſtows upon private men, their caſe muſt extend far and near, we muſt not upon all occaſions publiſh our Comments upon their actions, far leſs ought we to fly to Arms when our Caprice is not ſatisfied, nor when the Dreams and Deluſions of our particular Sect are diſcouraged. For, If men may run to Arms upon every occaſion, the Political World ſhould quickly tumble into the Original Chaos. Whatever Parties then there are that oppoſe the Doctrine of Non-Reſiſtance, thus ſtated, are Enemies to all Government, and when they themſelves are inveſted with Power and Authority, their Practice baffles their former Notions, and expoſes ſufficiently their Chimerical Ideas; and whatever branches there may be of this Controverſie, it muſt be agreed to on all hands, that the *Scots Presbyterians* were Rebels under *Charles I.* and *Charles II.* in all the Formalities of Rebellion.

Vitia dominantium tolerare debemus ſicut nimios imbres.
Cornel. Tacit.

The *Vindicator* himſelf thinks that the Authority of the Nation in the Convention or Parliament, may take away the Legal Right that belongs to the Clergy. Had not the Clergy as good right to their by-paſt *Stipends* as any man had to his private Eſtate?

Page. 26. and 27.

So it seems that in some cases the *Convention* may invade the *Property* of private men, especially the *Property* of the *Episcopal* Clergy, and this is no other stretch of *Arbitrary Power*, than what was practis'd formerly against the *Lieges* in the warmest weather of the *Covenant*, when private men were compelled to lend their money to Levy an *Army* against the *King*: yet since it was to advance the *Covenant* there was nothing *Arbitrary* in it, and though it was open *Robbery*, and never practis'd by any of our *Kings*, yet we were forced to stoop to *Ruin* and *Poverty*, because the *Covenanters* said that this was our *Liberty* and *Property*. So they that clamour most against *Arbitrary Power*, practise it most when they dare venture.

Another Imputation whereby the *Presbyterians* endeavour to sully the Reputation of the *Episcopal* Clergy is this, that the kindness that any have for *Episcopacy* proceeds from the *Episcopal* Clergy's indulging men in their sins and immoralities. And this is the old story, and contains nothing but their inveterate spite and malice. What is it that the *Episcopal* Church teaches that indulges men in their sins? What *Doctrine* is it, that's publickly owned or taught by the *Episcopal* Church, that has the least tendency to the breach of any of *Gods* Commandments? How long shall these *Sons of Strife* continue in their *Impudence*? Though this *Accusation* be as senseless as it is indefinite, yet upon this occasion they ordinarily magnifie their discipline, as the most *Sovereign* Remedy against the immoralities of the Age, much after the same manner that *Montebanks* do when they set off their *Drugs* with vehement and zealous *Harrangues*; and if you have the patience for a quarter of an hour you'll hear all that they can say. Whereas a grave experienced *Physitian*, will make no such promises, but he'll calmly consider the present temper of your *Body*, the Causes of your *Disease*, and proportion his Applications to your strength, and other Circumstances, without noise or Ostentation.

I know no effect that ever the *Presbyterian* Discipline had towards Reforming the *World*, unless you reckon that the murdering of *Bastard* Children was of that Nature. It cannot be denied but that the *Presbyterian* Ministers use long Discourses to the *Whores* that sit on the *Stool* of *Repentance*, but they cannot name three of them that ever mounted that *Publick* Seat but they became *Prostitutes*, and when once they made *Shipwrack* of their *Modesty*, one may guess what followed. And their publick appearance in this manner made them *impudent*. This is all the Reformation I know that their Discipline most eminently promotes; its true indeed there was a very remarkable Step towards the Reformation made by *Sir John Hall*, and his Associates, the first year of the *Revolution*, when the *Wells* were locked up, and none could have fresh *Water* upon *Sunday*, yet as much *Wine* and *Brandy* was allowed as one was pleased to call for. But if by their *Discipline*, they mean that endless and pragmatick inquisition into all Actions,

Actions, it is as impracticable, as it is burthensome; and though it be a natural step to advance their *Supremacy*, yet it is attended with so much *confusion* and *animosities*, that neither true Religion nor Liberty can endure it. It is pleasant to hear them declaim against the *Tyranny* of Papal Power, and yet meddle with all that ever he medled with.

Vid. Bramhal on
the Scots Discipline.

Act of General
Assembly 49.

We know what Profanations of the Name of God were occasioned by this *Discipline* in the year 1648. when the best of the Nobility and Gentry, and others were made to profess their *Repentance* for the *Lawful Engagement*. I do not plead against *Ecclesiastical Discipline*; for it is absolutely necessary to the *order* and *Preservation* of the *Church*, as it is a Society founded by our Lord and Saviour. But this new fantastick and apish imitation of strictness, is *inconsistent* with *reason*, as it is indeed *destructive* to true and regular *Devotion*. The *Vindicator* uses to refer his Readers to other Books, I cannot condemn that practise, therefore I wish him to Read *Bishop Bramhal's* Treatise of the new Discipline. There is nothing more desirable than to see the *Antient* Discipline revived, and all men ought to Pray that God would direct our *Ecclesiastical Governours*, to restore the *Primitive* Discipline, so as the most negligent may be awakened, directed, and encouraged to repent, and testify his *Repentance* by the most *unfeigned mortification*, and *Charity*.

Thus I have run over some of the General Heads that are scattered up and down his *Vindication*, and given you freely but very briefly my Opinion of them. The next thing I undertook for your satisfaction was to enquire into the *Spirit* and *Genius* of the Author, by the Characters that appear of him in his *Vindication*. Not that I conclude him *habitually* such, for perhaps the *paroxysms* of his Indignation are over, but this I may conclude that when this Book was written, he was overdriven with his passion: I do not immediately conclude him to be of *the Seed of the Serpent*, nor of *the Race of Esau*, nor a *Villain*, nor the *Successor of Judas Iscariot*, nor a *Rabshakeb*. Though he opposes the *Apostolical* Government of *Episcopacy*, he is not of my Opinion; but I do not think he deserves any Censure on that account that he is not of my Persuasion. His Adversaries cannot drive him to a greater absurdity than if he be made to vent his Passion in *personal Reflections*, and therefore I shall endeavour to fix nothing upon his person but what naturally follows from his *own* words.

His own manner-
ly expressions.

I charge him therefore in the first place with open and avowed *Partiality*. He rejects the Testimony of any man that is not of his Party, so he rejects the Testimony of *John Gibson*, one of the Magistrates of *Glasgow*, because, says he, he was of a party, and made * a Bailiff by the Archbishop;

Pag. 94.

* Alderman.

and

and all knew the Prelates Inclinations towards the present Civil Government. His Argument may be reduced into form thus, the Bishop was an enemy to the Civil Government, John Gibson was named a Bailiff by the Bishop: Ergo the Testimony of John Gibson ought not to be received in a Matter of Fact: this is very hard, how can a man at London be more credibly inform'd of a Matter of Fact in Glasgow, than by the Authentick Testimonies of the Magistrates of Glasgow, but he tells us the Magistrates were of a Party, and what of that? By this method of reasoning what becomes of Calderwood's History of the Presbyterians? Must not we believe him at all because he is of a different persuasion? Just so our Author treats Mr. Morer, one of the Prebendaries of Sarum, who wrote the first Letter of the Persecutions. The Vindicator tells us it is one lie from the beginning to the end, and why all this harshness and severity? Why? Because the Vindicator imagines him to be a Jacobite, though he ventured his person in Ireland, and swore the Oath of Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary, and wrote this Letter to one of his Ecclesiastical Superiors in England; yet the account he gave of the Scots Affairs did not please the Vindicator, and therefore he's immediately transformed into a Jacobite. This is a very hard case, but why may not even the Jacobites be received as Witnesses. The Jews when they swear upon the Pentateuch are received as Witnesses before all Judicatures, and in all Courts in Christendom; so are the Mahumetans when they swear upon the Alchoran, and all Pagans if they swear by the Idol of their Country. But Mr. Morer is no Presbyterian, and therefore his Testimony must be rejected; thus with one dash of his Pen he overthrows all the Accounts that he himself had from the West, to the Disparagement of the Episcopal Clergy, or in defence of their Enemies, for they are all of them of a Party, and obliged by their Oaths to ruin Episcopacy. And again he rejects the Testimony of a great and an exact Historian, because he was no Presbyterian. And again, The Testimony of a Minister, Witnessing the Persecution of another, must not be received.

Page 85.

Page 88.

Page 100.

Page 109.

Another thing very remarkable in this Book, is the Author's peremptory and dogmatick pretences to the Jus Divinum of Presbytery, contrary to the Modesty, or rather Caution of the first Presbyterians, who declared in their publick Confessions, that all Church Polity was variable, and changeable; but the Scots Presbyterians, think they cannot justify their Zeal for their new Polity, unless the People believe it to be of Divine Right. But how to make up this Divine Right from the Precepts of our Saviour, or the practice of the Apostles, or the Succession of the first Ages of Christianity, they know not; they are resolved to say it is of Divine Right, and then they work hard for strained Consequences, and hence it is that they are

very angry if their *intrinsic Ecclesiastical* power lodged in this *parity* be not obeyed, or *questioned*. So the *Vindicator* complains that such of the *Episcopal Clergy* as addressed to them, did consider them no otherwise than as a *Company* of men that derived all the Power they had from the *Convention*, and was not this a mighty affront? They cannot endure that they should be considered as *Delegates* of the State, when as yet all the Nation knows, and common Sense must determine they could have no power over the *Episcopal Clergy*, but what they derived from the State; and therefore all along he asserts positively, that the *Scots Presbytery* is the *immediate Institution of Jesus Christ*. But I must be so just to him as to acknowledge that most of all his Brethren, are equally *peremptory* and *dogmatick* upon this Head, and though *Calvin* acknowledges great honor and deference to be due to Prelates *etiam hoc nomine*, if they should embrace the Reformation, yet his Disciples are more improved, and cannot endure that any other Church Polity should prevail. From this proceed the *high* and *lofty* Epithets they bestow upon *Presbytery*; *Christ's visible Kingdom upon Earth*, his *Royal Crown and Scepter*, his *express Institution and Discipline*. And upon this Hypothesis they become proud and insolent, they despise all their opposites as men not acquainted with the Spirit of God, and enemies to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ.

Page 185.

Page 178.

Another thing I take notice of in his Writings, is, his *rudeness* and *vanity*. He represents his Adversary as a *Liar*, and a *Villain*, though he cannot prove that the Author of the History of the General Assembly wrote one *Lie*, from the beginning to the end, if the Accounts he got from such as were present were not so exact, he himself was not to be blamed; but the *Vindicator* cannot prove that any information he got was false. Again, one of his Ad-

Pag. 123.

versaries is represented as a *Liar*, and a *Slanderer*, and tell us again that the Council appointed that no *Decree* should pass in favour of the *Episcopal Clergy*, until the Parliament should determine in that *extraordinary* case; where I take notice, that according to the *Vindicator's* present Doctrine, the Council may *stop* and *disable* the *Laws*, especially when the the *Episcopal Clergy* Prosecute their *Debitors* before the *Ordinary Judge*, and therefore the Council may invade any mans *Legal Property*, contrary to the *Law*, and much more the *Parliament*; yet this is a wretch of *Arbitrary Power*, never heard of in *Scotland* notwithstanding of all the hideous Clamors of that *restless Faction*. He may if he will endeavour to justify that *Arbitrary stretch*, but I think that they who were most active in it, do truly think *shame* of it as a thing as much *unprecedented* and *unwarrantable*.

Again, He insinuates that the Clergy had Clubs for drinking, and that it is an impudent falsehood that either Dr. R. or Mr. *Malcolm* made application to the *Presbyterians*. As

Pag. 58.

for the last whether he made application, or after what manner, I neither know nor shall I ever enquire. As for the first he is at his rest, and I will not rake into his Ashes; but this is certainly known, although he had address'd unto the Presbyteries, he had been reject'd because he was one of the Ministers of *Edinburgh*; for his Party had determin'd to break through all obstacles of Justice and Decency, rather than suffer any of the Episcopal Clergy to continue within the City of *Edinburgh*. Nay, no Presbyterian was allowed, if once he had made the least Advances of Compliance with Episcopacy, as was then too visible in the Case of Mr *Wilky*.

The *Vindicator's* clownish Buffoonry, and insulting over the afflicted, in the 4th. page, I omit. You will excuse me if I do not transcribe the most part of his Book, the ordinary Epithets he bestows on his Adversaries are, that they are *impudent Slanderers* and *Villains*; but when his Heroic Passion is put into a higher ferment, they are *Successors* of *Judas Iscariot*, and *Rabshakes*. No doubt the Sisters will think that the *Vindicator* is a *precious convincing man*, he tramples upon the *Episcopal* Clergy as if they were below his notice, there is no grappling with a *Giant* of so much strength and reason.

We must be taught better manners than to venture upon this man of *Oak* and *Forehead*, poor Creatures! Have not we been taught better than to make publick the *Secrets* of the *Faction*? if this man write once again, he will ruin us for ever.

Is not the World well mended by this Reformation? But I had rather prove the *Vindicator* a Lyar than call him so, and therefore you may ask him who gave him information that my Lord *Dundee* had gathered together at *Edenburgh* two thousand men of the Kings *disbanded* Forces, that with them he might surprize the *Convention*, when all the Nation knows that when he retir'd from *Edenburgh* he had not above thirty or forty to attend his Person. Who saw the two thousand? And how comes the *Vindicator* to fix upon that precise number twice? Where were they *Mustered*? And is it likely that my Lord *Dundee* at the Head of two thousand well trained old Soldiers could be forced to retire from *Edenburgh* by all the *Vagabond Ruffians* that came from the *West*. Let the *Vindicator* recollect himself a little, and enquire where he had this information. What my Lord *Dundee* intended is not the Subject of our present enquiry, but I am very sure that if he had had the fourth part of that number the *Vindicator* alledges, he could have quickly made the *Convention* at that time retire: and this I confidently think, though the *Vindicator* Confutes this probability by telling Mr. *Morer*

that the *Presbyterian* Confidence is built on a better foundation than such as *Dundee* was; and here I must take notice of this Gentlemans *Charitable Temper* and *Condescension*. Mr. *Morer*, one of the *Prebendaries* of

Sarum, wrote that none doubted but that if my Lord *Dundee* had lived he would have changed at that time the *Face* of Affairs in *Scotland*. From this the *Vindicator* concludes that the Episcopal Party in *Scotland* placed their *Confidence* in none higher than my Lord *Dundee*, how is it possible to shun those venomous darts of spite and ill nature? So when ever you speak to a *Presbyterian* I advise you to take good heed what you say, and how; if you do not say every thing that may be said, they are sure to conclude, that what was left unsaid was not at all believed by you: so when Mr. *Morer* writes again he must tell his Patron that though such a change was probable according to the situation of Affairs at that time yet the Episcopal Party placed their *Confidence* in God. For if his words are not thus guarded the *Presbyterians* will immediately conclude that the *Episcopal Party* are but a pack of *Atheists* that place no *Confidence* in God, but lean on the *Arm of Flesh*.

I return from this *Digression* to that that I lately mention'd, viz. The *Vindicator's* story of two thousand disbanded Soldiers, which carries with it all the marks by which a willful and deliberate lye, may be known from modest and ingenuous Truth, and the reason why I instance in this particular is because the *Vindicator* was at *Edenburgh*, or not far from it, about that time, and therefore it is not probable but that he might have known the truth: and from this I conclude that either he lies deliberately, and willfully, or his Informers are Lyars, and idle talkers, or at best he himself, is guilty of supine negligence, in gathering true Informations. For to do him Justice, I promise to retract this publicly, if he get five or six men of any note even amongst the *Presbyterians* in *Edenburgh*, who will declare it under their hands that they knew that my Lord *Dundee* had gathered together two thousand *Disbanded Soldiers* at *Edenburgh*, before he retired from the *Convention*. And the *Vindicator* himself cannot deny but that this is an extraordinary piece of Condescension, that I should leave it to be decided by the Testimony of *Presbyterians* themselves, since he rejects all Episcopal Witnesses.

The next thing I instance, as to his Candour and Integrity, is this, that in the third page of his Preface he writes, that there was Advice written by Dr. *Canaries* to Mr. *Lisk*, to be communicated to the *Episcopal Party*, That they should yield feigned Obedience to the *Presbyterians* at present, and these words he caused to be Printed in a different Character, that every one might conclude they were the words of Dr. *Canaries* Letter; whereas the Doctor never wrote such a thing, nor any thing that can yield any such Consequence. And 'tis yet more pleasant to read his Letter that justifies this dissingenuous usage, because forsooth feigned Obedience was a Scriptural Phrase, and though the Doctor wrote no such thing, yet he thinks he was allowed to Print this Relation of him, so as all the World might conclude these words were the express words of Dr. *Canarie's* Letter, and this Lie is more un-

Second Vindication.
Edenb. Edit.

pardonable than the former, because it is *deliberate* and *unrepented* off. I shall mention one Instance more of his Candour and Integrity, and it relates to Mr. *Macmath*, whom he injures most atrociously.

And because he raises all his Batteries against Mr. *Macmath*, the Minister of *Lestrade*, we need no other proof of the *Vindicator*'s ingenuity, nor no other Character of his *genius* than to read that part of his Libel that relates to Mr. *Macmath*. First, he charges him with *Drunkennes*, but the *Vindicator* knew no such thing, only the *barbarous Villains* who wounded him upon the Road as he was Travelling from *Edenburgh* to his own House, they would take care to transmit to the *Vindicator* such stories as were most convenient for him to *propagate*, but Mr. *Macmath* was that very night, before he came from *Edenburgh*, in the company of two Gentlemen of Honor and Integrity, and appeals to them whether they could perceive in him either the *first beginnings*, or the *least appearance* of any excess or disorder, and their Testimony is of greater authority than all the stories that the *Vindicator* can patch together from such Villains as made an attempt upon his life.

Next he charges him with amorous, wanton, and *lascivious* behaviour, and I am glad the *Vindicator* mentions it, because in this very story we have a *notorious* instance of their Villany and Hypocrisie: there was a poor woman hired by the *Presbyterians* to say that Mr. *Macmath* once made Love to her, and she was prevailed with by her Brother, a Presbyterian, to say so, and when she was encouraged by them again to adhere to what she said, she declined it, and told them that she had said enough for any thing she had gotten. Her Brother, who had taught her thus to accuse an innocent man, was smitten with such a remorse (when he came to consider more narrowly what he had done) that he was in hazard to destroy himself, and actually did so, when he removed to the next Parish, by ripping up his own Belly. But it is no wonder to hear Mr. *Macmath* thus calumniated, when they had the impudence to accuse the Venerable Old Archbishop *Spotswood* of Incest

Anno 38.

with his own Niece of fourteen years old. And to make an end of what concerns Mr. *Macmath*, let me acquaint the Reader that such as were most active in his Trouble and Persecution, very shortly after felt the severity of Gods just Judgment. *John Clark*, who beat him with the great end of his Musket, was suddenly bruised to death by the fall of a Tree in the Wood of *Rosling*, so that he never spoke again: and for the other Mr. *Borthwite*, his Conscience did so check him, that he had no peace until he ended his life in a most lamentable Distraction and Madness. I am not so bold as to inter that the Persecuting of Mr. *Macmath* was the only sin that drew upon them the visible and sudden marks of Gods heavy displeasure, but I may very safely say that the Signatures of Gods anger are frequently legible enough

in the punishment of some mens sins, and that Atheistical Hypocrites seldom escape his indignation even in this World.

As for the *Vindicators* Tattling of Mr. *Finlason*, Mr. *Finlason* himself denyed all when he was challenged. But, that I may no longer detain the Reader, nor yet condemn my self to the drudgery of raking into that Puddle that is here heaped together against Mr. *Macmath*, let him compare the following Authentick Certificate in favours of Mr. *Macmath*, subscribed by the Gentlemen and others of his own Parish, with all the little *knawish* and *impudent* Lyes that the *Vindicator* has gathered already, or may hereafter invent, and then let him Judg as his discretion will lead him.

Lefwade, August 10. 1689.

WE Subscribers, Heretors, or such as represent them, Elders, and others within this Parish of Lefwade, do hereby Declare and Testifie that Mr. John Macmath, present Minister there, has been above these twenty years bygone in the said Ministry to our great satisfaction, and has Preached the Word of God faithfully, and performed other Duties of his Ministerial Function diligently; his Deportment and Behaviour being sutable to his Doctrine and Sacred Employment: wherefore we do own him as our lawful Minister, and are well pleased that he be continued in the peaceable exercise of his Ministry amongst us, as witness these presents subscribed with our hands. Sic Subscribitur.

Sir Will. Drummond of
Hautbornden, Kt.

} William Drummond.

Saintclare of Rosline,
Barronet.

} Jo. Saintclare.

Lately one of the Magi-
strates of Edenburgh.

} Jo. Johnstone.

Representing the Bar-
ronry of Prestone.

} Ro. Prestone.

Nicolson of Trabrowne,
one of the Magistrates of
Edenburgh, as represent-
ing Lefwade Barronry.

} Ja. Nicolson.

Son to the L. Prestone.

} Alex. Prestone.

Town Major of Eden-
burgh, living in the Parish
of Lefwade.

} Major Will. Murray.

Son to the L. Prestone.

} Char. Prestone.

Son to Major Murray.

} Pat. Murray.

Elders.

Alex. Lawder.

Ja. Chisbolme.

Will. Dobie.

Tbo. Geddes.

Archibald Johnstone.

Jo. Mulckin.

Tbo. Reek.

Ad. Threplain.

Will. Ramsay.

Alex. Porteous.

William Pouverfell.

Masters of Families.

John Rook.

Franc. Scott.

Pat Whytlaw.

Ja. Morison.

Jo. Mathre.

Geo. Johnstone.

Ds. Mackall.

Alex. White.

And, Summer.

Again,

Again he tells us, that it is well known that the Episcopal Party made all the *essays* they were capable of to carry the Elections for the Convention, when it is far better known, that in several Shires the Episcopal Gentry declin'd *industriously* their being chosen for that *Convention*, particularly in the Shire of *Ross* where the *Vindicator* dare not say that the Presbyterians can carry the *Elections*. And let me but once for all tell you, that the Presbyterians had many Advantages of their *Opposites* at that time not to be named. To be short, his Book is every where interspersed with the filliest *shufflings* and *tergiversations*: it is not enough for him to say that he is not acquainted with the Matter of Fact, when any thing is *affirmed* by his *Adversary*, that he is a stranger to, but instead of this; he presently flies in his Face and gives him the *Lie*. I'll give you one Instance of this rudeness, Mr. *Morer* wrote to his Patron, that there were some that Sate in the late Convention, who were not *infest* in their Estates, and consequently were excluded by the Fundamental Laws of the Nation. This the *Vindicator* denies, and tells us, his *denial* is a *sufficient* answer, and all this because Mr. *Morer* did not name the *Members* of the Convention that were not *infest* in their

Estates. Had it not been an extraordinary *indiscretion* to have named particular Gentlemen, and to publish what might be so prejudicial to their Interest amongst their *Creditors* and *Acquaintances*. And if the *Vindicator* will generously conceal their names, he shall know them too when he pleases; and when he thus contends for the honor of that Convention, he in the next Line *blunders* most *unhappily*, and tells the World in Print that some Sate in that Convention who were forfeit for *High Treason* by all the *solemnities* and *forms* of Law, and that before the Sentence was Repealed by any *Judicatory*: and therefore I advise the *Vindicator* not to bind up the Sovereign Powers of the Earth to little *Punctilio's* and *Forms* of Law, but let him be a little more kind to *Arbitrary Power*, and the extraordinary *Exigences* of State. And since he thinks it very just that the Convention should allow such a procedure against all the *Forms* of Law; why may not he allow the King and Council to put the very *Laws* in Execution against *Phanaticks*, when the *essentials* of Government are endangered by their *Conspiracies* and *Insurrections*. There are frequent Instances of his *Disingenuity* and *shifting*, which no body expects should be particularly *refuted*: because they engage ones enquiries into all those Pamphlets he pretends to *refute*; and because the Book would swell to a prodigious *Bulk*, and the Publick is not at all concerned to know the *Circumstances* of every particular Ministers Sufferings in the West of *Scotland*.

I could in the next place inform you of his Inconsistencies. He treats his *Adversaries* as *Brethren*, yet in his Preface he insinuates that such *Disputes* with the

Episcopal Party are but the *strugglings* and *oppositions* between the *Seed of the Woman*, and the *Seed of the Serpent*; and that there are but few *Matters of Fact* that he pretends to any *knowledge of himself*. Yet in the next Line almost, he tells us that he doth not build on *hear-say* or *common Talk*; and yet the materials of his Book are but the *Testimonies* of many who were *Actors* or *Abettors* of the *Western Villanies*: and if he did not build on *hear-say*, how came he to *Print* that *Mr. George Henry*, Minister at *Carstarphin*, meddled with a *Brewery*, which is notoriously false? And though this be a trifling story, yet is it an undeniable Evidence that the *Vindicator* was heedless and inconsiderate in gathering true Materials.

Ibidem.

Again, The *Vindicator* tells us that they do not think *K. William* an *Idolater* though he *Communicate* with the *Church of England*, yet when some of his Party mounts the *Desk* and declaims their *Maccaronicks*, they positively conclude that the *Church of England* is *idolatrour*. Again, he does not allow that the *Clergy* who *Address'd* the *Commission* of the *General Assembly* had any measure of *wit*, yet their *Contrivances* were founded on *deep Consults*. But let me tell the *Vindicator*, that no man, or *Society of men*, has the *Monopoly of Prudence*, the most cautious steps may be sometimes *frustrated* and the *wisest men* may sometimes widely mistake their *measure*: and the *Hearts of all Men*, as well as the *Hearts of Kings and Princes*, are in the *hands of God*, and their motions directed by his *Providence*. And after all, let me tell the *Vindicator* once more, that that little *Contrivance* and *Formula* of an *Address* blew up their *pretended Assembly*: and let me tell him more, yet (tho I pretend to no acquaintance in *Political* things) that it is *very probable* that those very *Laws* by which the *Ringleaders* of *Presbytery* thought to secure their *Tyranny* for ever, will occasion its *fall and ruin*, though they endeavour to *support* it by the *Pens* and *Lungs* of all its *Associates*.

Pag. 115.

I could name many other *Inconsistencies*, I have no room for them: every other Line is stuffed with such *mean* and *scurrilous* Railings that it is *nauseous* to repeat them; yet I cannot but take notice of his *Vanity*. He treats his *Adversaries* with *scorn* and *contempt*. The *Author* of the *History* of the *General Assembly* he treats as a *Sciolist*, and as a *Momus*, and he is enraged that he should presume to write that one of the *Presbyterian Doctors* could not speak *Latine*: Such an *Affront* was not to be endured by a man that had *signalized* himself so much in *Controversial Feats*, and therefore I advise you when you meddle with the *Presbyterians*, to make your *Approaches* with all possible *Caution* and *Reverence*. A *Presbyterian* had rather be accused of *Adultery*, *Sodomy*, or *Incest*, than to be thought *Ignorant*, and this is the reason why the *Author* of that *History*

Pag. 183. and
Pag. 169.
Mr. Gilbert Rule.

is lash'd with all the severities of *Satyr*, and the *Vindicator* would have forgiven him any thing rather than the least *Insinuation* of being *ignorant*. Alas! this was not to be endured that one of their Leaders, and who had made a remarkable Figure, should be thus run down and exposed to laughter. For though the Presbyterians look very demure and grave, you mistake them, if you think them *Stoicks*: If you venture to say any thing that may rob them of that pleasant *Imagination* of their own *Grandeur*, that lovely *idea* that they have of *themselves*, and their extraordinary *performances*.

But I must tell you what occasioned his heavy displeasure against the Author of the History of the General Assembly, That Author gives one Instance why he thought Mr. *Gilbert Rule* did not understand thoroughly the things that he wrote of, because when he Cites the Epistle of St. *Jerom* to

Evagrius, and from thence Cites the Sentence you see in the Margine * he must needs force the word *ordination* in that *Epistle* to signify the *Ordering of the Meetings*. This Exposition the Author of that History (such an Infidel he is) thinks a little *Paradoxical*, if not *down-right Ignorance*; because no *Ecclesiastical Writer* in that, or any former Age understood any such thing by that

word so *plaved*, as it is in that Epistle; besides there's no mention of any *meeting* near that word, that *determin* it to that signification. And since this Exposition was so very odd, the Author of that History did treat it and the Inventer of it very familiarly. Besides, others do think that if this Exposition be received, it will oblige us to understand St. *Jerom*, in many places, in a Sense contrary to the Opinion of all former Ages.

Thus I find St. *Jerom* informs us that such and such a man was *Ordinatus ab Apostolis Episcopus* of such a place, therefore the meaning must be that such a man was appointed to meet the Apostle at such a place. However the *Vindicator* treats him as a *Sciolist*, a *Momus*, a poor *sequacious Animal*, that follows such as went before him. But if he had been acquainted with the penetrating *Genius* of Mr. *Rule* and others, he had no doubt understood the *Fathers* better. It is very difficult to guess what to impute this extravagant Fancy to, he thought it dangerous to allow that *Ordinatio* did signify the Imposition of Hands, at least he wished such a power might not be granted to a Bishop, and therefore he will have *Ordinatio* in that Epistle of St. *Jerom* to *Evagrius*, to signify the ordering of something, though that thing be not named in St. *Jerom*; and if it signifies the ordering of something (as the *Vindicator* profoundly Reasons,) why not the ordering of a Meeting? And if it was the ordering of a Meeting? Why not the ordering of an Ecclesiastical Meeting? Yet all this time it is not determined whether this ordering of the Meeting be an Authoritative

tive appointing of the time *when* they should meet, and what they should treat of, or only presiding as *Moderator* amongst them, when the Collective body themselves appointed the meeting. Because, I say, this is left uncertain; perhaps the *Vindicator* will judge it most convenient to adhere to the last. If he had said, that *Ordinatio* signified the ordering of a *Dromedary* it had been more to his purpose, for certainly the ordering of such an Animal made not so great a distinction between a Bishop and Presbyter as the ordering of Ecclesiastical Meetings.

How contrary such a fancy is to the received exposition of that word, will best appear when we consider other places in the works of *S. Jerom*, where the word *Ordinare* is made use of, and let us suppose that the word must be interpreted according to the new Critick. Thus we find *St. Jerom*, *Comment. 1. Epist. ad Timothee. Cap. 3. ab initio Primum laicos instituit de quibus optimi quique in sacerdotium eliguntur & sic dicit quales debeant ordinari.* Then the meaning must be according to this late discovery, that the Apostle declared such as were fit to be appointed to meet. Again, *S. Jerom* in his *Comment on the Epist. to Titus* in those words: *For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou mightest ordain,* He hath these words, *Quæ desunt recto tenore corrige & tunc demum presbyteros poteris ordinare, cum omnes in Ecclesia fuerint recti,* when all have been blameless in the Church, then thou mayst appoint Presbyters to meet. And again, in his *Catalogue Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, speaking of *S. James the Brother of our Lord*, *Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini cognomento justus — Post Passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus,* the meaning must be, that he was appointed by the Apostles to meet at *Jerusalem*. And in the same Book it is said again, *Timotheus autem Ephesorum Episcopus ordinatus a Beato Paulo,* that is to say, *Timothy the Bishop* was appointed by *S. Paul* to meet at *Ephesus*. Again, *Polycarpus Joannis Apostoli discipulus & ab eo Smyrnæ Episcopus ordinatus, totius Asiæ princeps fuit.* I need add no more testimonies to make this Critical observation more *ridiculous*, and I defie all that ever looked into the Presbyterian Books to find any thing so palpably ignorant and foolish, as this exposition of that passage in *S. Hierom*, except it be the *Vindicator's* Notion of *decretum prædamnatum*, which I shall examine before I end this Letter, and yet I do not remember that ever I read any Man more proud and supercilious; but Ignorance and Pride go ordinarily together. I shall not contend with him about this non-sensical Whimsy, I wish with all my heart he had writ a Book in Quarto of such Expositions of the most difficult places in the Fathers, and I dare assure him such Books would be read by the Youth in the *Universities* with far greater *Delight* than his *Vindication* of the Kirk of Scotland. And

I have a far greater Opinion of the knowledge of most of his Brethren, than to think that there are two of them in the Nation (except it be *Mr. Russel* and *Mr. Gourlay*) that can agree with him in this *Exposition*; the reason why I mention it here is not to dispute with him any farther concerning it, but to give you an Instance of his insufferable Pride and Vanity that he resents the least Contradiction to his *Nonsense* with so much *bitterness* and *indignation* *.

* *Nulli potenti-
us reprehenduntur,
quam qui maxime
laudari merentur.*
Plin. Ep. 20. lib. 7.

Pag. 183:

Another Instance to the same purpose we have again p. 183. The Author of the History of the General Assembly said, That such as were thrust into Universities and Colleges by the Presbyterian Faction were short of their Predecessors. This nettles the Vindicator, who, (if his *sufficiencies* be such as he fancies) should have *sighted* it. And therefore he compares the men of his way with their *Predecessors*, (I suppose he must mean

such as are *lately* promoted into the *Seminaries* of Learning) if the Vindicator means *Mr. Rules Predecessors* in the College of *Edinburgh* that are already dead, He is extravagantly *impertinent*; If he mean the *Masters* lately ejected, I assure him, they never *compared themselves* nor their *Sufficiencies* with any dead nor alive; the more any man knows the less he thinks of it; and though Knowledge in it felt be very valuable, yet such *Thraasonical* Boastings of it are very opposite to the nature of it. It may be the Vindicator thinks that the ejected *Masters* wrote so *advantageously* of themselves: but if that be his mis-

*As to the Chara-
cters given to some
of them, neither
they nor the Author
of that History was
to be blamed for it.*

* *Tullius Orat.*
*in Cæcil. N. m cum
omnis arrogat. a o-
diosa est, tum illa
Digeni atque elo-
quentiæ multo mo-
lestissima.*

† *Nam levia in-
genia quia nihil ab-
bent nihil sibi detrahunt, magno ingenio multaq; nihilominus habituro convenit
etiam simplex veri erroris confessio. Celsus de Medic. lib. 8.*

ficult for any man that was intirely a stranger to his Predecessors, to know what Books they recommended or were themselves acquainted with. But the Author mentioning casually Mr. Gilbert Rule's want of *Latin*, brought the Vindicator into this lofty strain of Comparisons, no doubt it was to let the World see how well he understood the Roman Authors, that he cites *Plutarch* and *Simonides* in *Latin*, but a little *Latin* may go very far if it be dexterously managed, and it may be worth his while to consider the direction † *Buchanan* gave the *Franciscans*. But if he would be entreated to put on a more chearful humour, I would tell him freely my opinion on the whole matter; and that is, that a man may be learned, and judicious, and know

a great many excellent Books, and reason closely and yet not speak the *Latin* readily; so that there is no necessity to appear buffy and out of humour, tho it were said that he did not speak *Latin* purely and fluently, that accomplishment depends upon long practice and upon all Revolutions (and sometimes without them) the publick Schools have their *Factions*, and some are ready to censure what

is not justly censureable, and this might occasion the Boys to be a little more severe than perhaps was allowable, when this Rabbi spoke something instead of *Latin* that was neither *Latin* nor *Scotch*.

But I must tell him withal what I heard from eye and ear Witnesses in (and this I have more credible Attestations than any of the Testimonies the Vindicator brings to disparage the Clergy) That the said Mr. Rule did publickly in his Prelections in *plenis Academiae comitiis*, say, That one that did so and so, as the Church of *England* did, was *guiltus Idolatriæ*; nor have I this from the younger Boys of that House, but from such as need not be named and cannot reasonably be suspected of lying. And I must tell Mr. Rule, tho such an unhappy Trip would vilifie him amongst the Students, yet it never lessens him in my Opinion, because ones *Imagination* may be so fix'd upon the thing, that he forgets what Language he ought to speak. But I will tell you of another thing that I think was yet worse.

At a publick Commencement, apprehending that a Gentleman who was disputing against the *Præses* did bear too hard upon him; He got up very gravely, and spoke to the *Præses* thus, *Domine Præses, require illum ut proponat Argumentum categoricæ*. It is true, that *require illum* is *Latin*; for (if I remember right) it may be met with in *Eunuch. Terent.* But in a sense vastly different from what was intended by Mr. Rule. For the sense intended by Mr. Rule no doubt, was that the *Præses* would oblige the Opponent to be more methodical. and if that be the meaning, it could not be more unhappily express'd,

† *Buchan Francisc.*
Novi ego qui tantum ter-
quinq. latina teneret
Verba, sed ingenii sic dex-
teritate valebat,
Ut quocunque loco, de re
quacunque parata,
Semper & ad nutum posita
in statione teneret.

for *requirere aliquem* in true *Latin* signifies to search for one again and again, to see where he may be found. I shall give Mr. Magnus Prince. you one Instance more, It is this, Mr. Rule finding that one of the Students in a *Harrangue*, advanced some things that were *unagreeable* to him, and favourable to some of the *Masters* that were lately ejected, He got up and offered to *silence* the Youth, and said, That *ille declamat contra statum Regni*, He meant no doubt the *late Convention* and *Parliament*, and any thing against them in the *old Latin* was *contra Ordines Regni*, how this ought to be express'd after the Reformation I know not. I can make no Apology for keeping you so long to such Impertinencies, but who can help it: Why shall men give themselves the trouble to answer Books so accurately as the Vindicator pretends to do, that there must not be a *Cobweb* in all their foldings unswept. This put the Vindicator upon many impertinent Essays, and if I had time to insist upon them I could furnish you with very pleasant Instances out of his Answers to Mr. Morer's Letter. But the Vindicator must refute accurately; and this obliges him to *condescensions* below *Gravity* and *Manhood*. Every where we have visible marks of the Vindicator's *Genius*, every where he stoops so low when he has nothing to pick up but straws and broken Pins, the Spirit of Contradiction eats out the vitals of his Soul, and ever and anon puts him upon *silly* and *extravagant* impertinencies: For nothing else can it be imputed than to his impardonable vanity — *his wishing this Sciolist or some other would attempt the refuting his Books.*

I must confess, I read his Vindications and his pretended Answer to the *Irenicum*, and if he be not improved since he wrote those Tracts, he deserves no particular Answer, for his Explication of S. *Ferom's* Epistle, and his *Decretum prædammatum* (of which hereafter) are Indications of his groundless and *illiterate* Fopperies: if he had defended himself by the common Pleas of learned *Presbyterians*, he ought to be treated with Civility and Discretion; but when he presumes to dictate either blasphemous Nonsense, (such as his *decretum prædammatum*) or *visionary* and *childish* Romances (such as his fancy of the meaning of *Ordinatio* in S. *Ferom's* Epistle) he should in this case be treated according to his Character, for it is not possible that so much ignorance could dwell but in the company of so much Pride, and therefore I appeal to all the *Scots Presbyterians*, if ever they yet discovered any such *monstrous Nonsense* written or said by any man that pretended to have read but one System in his lifetime, and yet this *Mormo* of a Scholar must forsooth strut with so much insolence and vanity, as if he were teaching some *Americans*, who were never acquainted with the civilized part of Mankind. There have been many attempts used by different Parties to expose

one another for their Ignorance and Immoralities, but I defie all men to name one Instance of greater Ignorance, either before or after the Reformation than this one Notion of his *Decretum prædammatum*, and yet forsooth he must pretend to explain and defend the *Calvinian* System, and takes occasion by an innocent Sentence or two, to thrust himself into this Scuffle without considering whether he understood the Controversie or not, but I leave him to the Chastisement of others.

Good Nature and Christian Modesty teach us to hide and extenuate the weakneses of others; but when those very men pretend to give Rules to all mankind, they ought to be put in mind that it is not yet time for them to appear so *arrogant* and *presumptuous*. Affectation is the meanest Vice, and an intollerable piece of *Hypocrisie*; we are not so ugly by our *natural defects*, as by the Accomplishments that we *counterfeit*, and this is the Hereditary uncurable Disease of our Pedling little Reformers. They cannot indure to follow the common Sentiments of Mankind, they are all for *heights*, and *singularities*. He that walks not in the common Road, where the way is safe, must be *silly*, and *hypocondriack*, or *proud*, and *designing*; and therefore the Spirit of Christianity teaches us to believe and practice the *indisputable* Truths of our Religion, more than the peculiar Opinions of broken *Schismaticks*, and lesser Fraternities. Sometimes I have had some kind Thoughts towards the *Quakers*; but when I considered that they needlessly forsake the innocent Customs of Mankind, the Universally acknowledged Rules of Decency, and the Universal Tradition of the Church, I must think that they are led by a Spirit of *Delusion* and *Bride*. Nothing recommends us to God more than true Humility, and it is an undeniable proof of Integrity and Self denial to comply with the innocent Customs of the World, and therefore our Saviour left us an Example, by which we may in the midst of all tentations live in the World, and yet continue unspotted by its infection. I have digressed too far, not from what I designed, but from the *Vindicators* account of things.

I am afraid I may get upon the Finger-ends, because I did not name my Witnesses for the Latin *Elegancies* that I lately mentioned; but if he writes to the Bookseller whose name is prefixt, he shall know as many Witnesses as are necessary, and forty more such Barbarisms.

To end, and to complete this Character of the *Vindicator*, I might mention his apparent *Shufflings* and *Tergiversations*, for when the Outrages done to the *Clergy* are open and *notorious*, then he extenuates it as no great Injury, when some of them were *beat* upon the *Head*, and *Legs*, and others of them made to go through *deep waters* in the *midst* of *Winter*.

But among all the Flights of his *Invention* there is none more remarkable than this unwary concession, that Ecclesiastical Judicatories that enquire into Scandals are not obliged to follow *the Forms of other Courts*. I thought that the Forms of Civil

Courts were wisely appointed partly to prevent our being surprized, partly to hinder (as far as humane Prudence could prevent) all *Forgeries*, and *Combinations*, against the *innocent*, and that the Forms were but the *external Fences*, that the Law invented to guard *Justice* and *Equity*. But this Author tells us that its doubted (no doubt amongst Learned Men) whether the *Ecclesiastical* Court be obliged to follow *such Forms*. It is very odd that the Laity among the *Scots Presbyterians*, who pretend to be at the greatest Remove from *Popery*, shall thus calmly stoop to the most intollerable slavery of the *Inquisition*.

Next to this Concession is his fair Advertisement to the Church of *England*, that indeed the *Covenanters* do not think themselves *obliged* to reform the Church of *England*, unless they are called to it; but if the *Godly* in *England* call them, then all their *Ammunition* must be employed to serve their dear Brethren in *England*.

Next to this, let me instance his shameful Shuffling about the Toleration lately granted to *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, he tells us, that they expressed as much as they were capable their dislike of the Toleration given to the *Papists* for their *Hereses* and *Idolatry*, yet their Agents, then at Court, wrote *Books* (such as they were) pleading that the *Penal Laws* ought to be Repealed; but withal the *Vindicator* adds that they do not grudge Liberty to any others who can shew as good a *Warrant* for their way of Worship as they do, *i. e.* they have a *Divine Right* for their way; and none others can have a *Divine Right* if they have it; because their way is different from all others; and therefore at bottom they are against *Toleration* as the most mischievous thing in the World: and in the time of the late Troubles they exclaimed against it, as a thing worse than the *Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*. Now you have no other Character of the *Vindicator* from me, than what I have extracted from his Book, nor do I conclude him to be habitually guilty of such shuffling and disingenuity; but single Acts may grow into rooted Habits. He is so deeply tinctur'd with the *julleness* of his *Faction*; that he'll rather question whether the Body of the Sun is *luminous*, than admit the least *scruple* concerning the *Divine Right* of *Presbytery*.

The next thing I promised to Discourse of, was his Theological Reasonings that occasionally falls under his Consideration, when he pleads the Innocence of the *Presbyterians*.

It is true, the *Vindicator* does not designedly insist on those *Theological* heads that I am shortly to speak of, but *incidentally* they fall in his way; but he cannot forbear his *venomous Squibs*, when he mentions the practice of the *Catholic Church*, that mostly expose their *Novelty* and *Enthusiasm*. The first

first I take notice of is his Censure of the *Catholic* Observation of Christmas; The Author of the second Letter did very *judiciously* observe how *diametrically* opposite the western Phanaticks are to the *spirit* and *practice* of the *Catholic* Church, That they should begin their *Barbarities* against the Clergy upon that very day upon which the Church did celebrate the *Nativity* of our blessed *Saviour*; and which the Angelical Hosts of Heaven did *magnifie* with *triumphant* Songs; the Vindicator cannot let this Observation pass without his *Theological Animadversions*. And he tells us in the first place, that the Author of that Letter *valu'd himself upon this fine Notion*, certainly the Author could not value himself upon this Notion, but he had great reason to value the *universal* practice of the Christian Church from the first plantations of Christianity. Next the Vindicator tells us, that it is ridiculous to assert that that day was celebrated by the Court of Heaven. *What?* says he, *Did the Court of Heaven keep the Anniversary day?* This is profoundly wise. There is no standing before the *wit* and *smartness* of such *Repartees*. What, did not the Court of Heaven celebrate the birth of our blessed *Saviour*? And was not the *Anniversary* Solemnity of this *Festival* a just *imitation* of what the Court of Heaven did? But he asks if the Court of Heaven did keep an *Anniversary*? For the great Danger is in that word *Anniversary*. But might not the Christian Church take care that this *glorious* *Mystery* should never be forgotten? And was it not *reasonable* that our *Posterity* should remember it, as well as they to whom it was first reveal'd? and could the Christian Church take more *effectual* *methods* to preserve the memory of it than by appointing this Anniversary Festival? He grants that the *Institution* is very *ancient*, but that the Church did keep it in all Ages *is said without book*; If he means that there are no *Presbyterian* Books that give *Evidence* for this *Festival*, we grant it; but if he mean that the Church did not observe it from the very days of the Apostles, we desire to know when it began? and in what Period of the Church it was not observed? and then we may see more clearly into the *Origine* of this *Festival*: And tho it had not been from the beginning the *Christian* Church may continue the *practice* of it upon the *best* *reasons*. He asks again, If our *Saviour* was born upon the 25th day of *December*, but this is *childish* and *impertinent*, when the Church did order the *Commemoration* of that *Mystery* on the 25. of *December*, she did not decide that *Chronological* Nicety, whether our *Saviour* was born on the 25. of *December*, nor was it needful to encrease the *Devotions* of the Church, that they should be performed with regard to one day more than to another, as if they depended upon such a *Critical Minute* of
time.

time, I hope the Vindicator knows that the 25. of December in France is not the 25. of December in Britain; and yet the Christians of either communion celebrate the Natiuity of our blessed Saviour with regard to the Calculations of the Country in which they live, nay, he may

Vid. Mr. Medes Discourse of Christmas.

know that there are Considerable Objections against the common Era of the Christians. But the Vindicator thinks that such an Anniversary day is not to be kept by Gods Appointment. But hath not God appointed us to obey the Apostles and their Successors our

lawful Ecclesiastical Rulers to the end of the World: And may not they regulate the publick Solemnities and returns of Gods Worship? Is there any thing in this Regulation but what hath a natural tendency to preserve and propagate the great truths of the New Testament? With what impudence then dare we refuse obedience to the universal Church, when her Constitutions are so just, so wise and so agreeable to the whole tenor of the Gospel? If all the Ecclesiastical Constitutions from the days of the Apostles had been written in the Bible, could one read it in a thousand years? There was a plain necessity in that case to have continued the immediate inspiration in the Church until the consummation of all things. Upon this their Hypothesis Reason becomes useles to order the publick Solemnities of the Church, the Christian Faith being once revealed, they needed not the assistance of a new Revelation to order its publick Solemnities; For when the festivities and Fasts of the Church were only conversant about the Articles of Faith already reveal'd, it is suppos'd that common sense and discretion must cloath the great Mysteries of our Religion, with such vehicles of time, place, and publick Solemnity, as best preserve their reverence, and transmit them to Posterity. But this is an unfortunate mistake, an original Blunder of the whole Party; and as long as they keep to this Maxim they must necessarily continue stubborn and ungovernable, and proof against the wisest Constitutions of the Christian Church: for they

Quia scriptum non legimus ideo iustum non credimus.

must have Scripture for such things as could not be contain'd in the Scripture; but he fortifies this with a Latin Sentence, as if Nonsense could change its Nature by being put into Latin. For the Question is not of Articles of Faith, but concerning the Consti-

tutions of the universal Church. But perhaps the Vindicator might yield to the Observations of Christmas, if the Observation of it were not anniversary. There is some hidden dangerous Plot in that word Anniversary, as if our Posterity were not to be educated in that Faith which we believe. And so Enthusiastick our Presbyterians are become, that they broach Principles unknown to all the subdivisions of Dissenters in England; and tho more knowing and intelligent among them

them never scruple the observation of an Anniversary day, since they yearly commemorate the dreadful Fire of London, by Fasting and Prayers.

From all this I conclude, That it is very dangerous, if not impious, to separate from the Church in those excellent Constitutions that have been received from the beginning, and in all Countries where the name of *Jesus* hath been worshipped, such Constitutions and Solemnities have been derived from the Apostles or Apostolick times.

When the World was enlightened by the knowledge of the Son of God, he did not extinguish the light of Reason, but he supposes it, and reasons from it, and strengthens it, and there is nothing more strongly enclined towards God, and the Communications of his Spirit, than true and unbiassed Reason. Therefore such Constitutions [as the reason of all Mankind is agreed in] have nothing in them contrary to the purity of our Religion.

If Anniversary days and Festivals have been profaned among the Pagans to the worship of Idols, why may they not be sanctified by the true Object of Worship, and the honour of *Jesus Christ*? Publick Solemnities have nothing in their own nature that is reproveable no more than the motion of the Sun, or the vicissitude of Seasons, if any part of our time be abused to excess or riot, or the worship of an Idol, we are liable to the Justice of God.

A short digression.

But when we return from Idols to the true God, when we change our excess into fasting, and prayer, and when the whole Scene is become pure, what is there in all this that can be blamed? Do not we see all Nations agree in this, that publick Solemnities, and anniversary Festivals, and Fasts are necessary to the being and beauty of Religion, even those Nations that are at the greatest distance from our Customs, our Language, our Laws, and way of living, upon the Conversion of Nations to the Christian Religion; some of the places where they worshipped their Idols have been dedicated to the true God; and was it not a happy Victory over the Kingdom of Darknes when the publick Solemnities of Idolatry, times and places, have changed their Objects, their Exercises, and their End.

It is true, the great Anniversaries of the Jewish Religion were appointed immediately by divine Authority. But had not they other Anniversaries not immediately appointed by God, and do you read that ever the Prophets did reprove the Jews for such Anniversaries. They did indeed reprove their negligence and indevotion in them, but the thing it self was acknowledged reasonable and prudent, and a very powerful instrument of true Religion when managed with Contrition, true Simplicity and Piety. Zach. Did ye at all fast unto me saith the Lord. The Fasts mentioned here are of humane appointment, and yet anniversary.

Our Saviour was present at the Feast of the *Dedication*, for which there was not any *immediate* Divine Institution; and though he had not been present, if it had been *superstitious* he had certainly *reproved* it, and given directions against such *usages* in the general. To shake off all the *externals* of Religion, is as dangerous as the multiplying of them, the one is the Error of the *Romanists*, and the other the *superstition* of the *Dissenters*. It is certain that nothing preserves Knowledge of Christian Religion amongst the *Body* of the People more than the *Festivals* of the Church; for it is not left to the *Arbitrary* or *Extemporary Fits* of Devotion, but the Church by her *excellent* Discipline orders the matter so, that it is not possible to forget the Faith unto which we have been *once* Baptized: but amongst the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, the People are taught by their Leaders to despise all *Forms*, such great souls ought not to be fettered to the Rules and Methods of the Universal Church, and therefore it is very rare to find a Child in the West of *Scotland*, that can repeat the Commandments or the Creed (I mean the Children of *Presbyterian* Parents) and by such *Enthusiastick* pretences, *Arbeitsin* is insensibly promoted, and the *Body* of the People alienated from the *simplicity* of Christian Religion, and scarcely will they allow any man to be acquainted with true Religion that mentions those first Principles of it. It is not possible to tell how much their opposition to *Forms* and *Festivals* of the Church has insatuated their People, there is nothing can make a *Clown* in the West of *Scotland* laugh so heartily, as when the Curate recommends to their Children the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, and *Ten Commandments*; and therefore they have no opinion of any Mans understanding, unless he entertain them with Discourses of God: *unsearchable* decrees, of *Justification* before *Conversion*, and how the *Convictions* of natural Conscience may be distinguished from the *Convictions* that proceed from the Spirit of God: to observe the *Festivals* of the Church is but a piece of antiquated Superstition. But we ought to remember that the stated *Festivals* and *Fasts* of the Church do preserve, and increase true Devotion and Mortification. Fasting is acknowledged a necessary Instrument of Religion by all Nations who profess any Religion at all. It is not enjoined, but suposed by our Saviour: why may not then the Church regulate and direct the Publick Solemnities of Fasting, as well as of Prayer. There is nothing so proper to fix our attention as Fasting, it delivers the Soul from the oppressions of the Body, and restores it to its true and native Sovereignty over our Lusts and Passions. The stated Periods of Fasting oblige the most stubborn and impenitent to think of his Soul, and the visible Practice of the Church Preach Repentance more effectually, and make more lasting Impressions than the loose and indefinite Homilies of self-conceited men.

The External Solemnities of Religion may be abused (as the most excellent things are) when they are left to the Conduct of humane weaknesses;

ness; but it is not possible to preserve Religion among the Body of Mankind, without those Vehicles of Form and Order. Nothing hinders the Reformation of the Grecian Churches, from the variety of their Errors and Superstitions, so much as the open neglect of Fasting among the Protestants, and this Practice is not to be defended, but rather lamented and amended. What a Cruelty is it in all the Sectaries to deprive the People of the Publick helps of Prayer and Fasting? Who can justify this, that considers the many Incumbrances, Tentations, Weaknesses, that we daily encounter? They that set up Methods of their own, in opposition to the Wisdom of the Church, in all Ages may amuse the People for a while, but can produce nothing that is solid or useful. It is certain that the Grecian Churches had, long ere now, made an utter Apostacy from the Christian Religion, if the ancient and fix'd Discipline of the Church did not retain them in the Faith, and when we consider how much the Religion that we are Baptized into, triumphs over *Sensualities and Concupiscence*, we cannot but acknowledge the Wisdom and Beauty of the ancient Discipline. The most useful things in Art or Nature, may be sadly abused by Folly or Ignorance. We are not to separate from the Roman Church, farther than they have separated from the Wise and Primitive Constitution of the first Ages of Christianity; and all the Protestants abroad seem to agree in this Truth, for they Preach and Pray Publickly upon the great Fasts and Festivals of the Church. The publick *Seasons* of Devotion are the Catechism of the People. It is true, when there is no day fixt for the Uniform Celebration of such a Myſtery it may be remembered by some; but it is not credible that all the People will remember it; but when the day is fixt we cannot forget it, and from our Infancy we are easily trained in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord, and in the simplicity of Christian Religion, free from *Jewish* Superstition (*touch not, taste not, handle not*, with which all our Sectaries are unhappily Leavened) as well as from giddiness and *Enthusiasm*.

Vid. Dr. Gunning
of the Lent-Fast.

We may seek for
rest in new ways, but
we shall never find
it but in the old.

Colloff.

The next thing that I mention, is his Accusation against the Episcopal Church, that they were guilty of Schism: For, He tells us that he knows no Schism, but such as was caused by his Opposites, and this is pleasant enough. There is a Company of men lately started up in the Christian Church, and if the Universal Church does not immediately strike Sail to their Novelties, all must be concluded *Schismatics*. By our Baptismal Vowes we are obliged to preserve the Unity of the *Catholic Church*, we are Members of that visible Body, that worship the true God through *Jesus Christ*, and consequently we are obliged to worship God in Unity and in Society, nor can we separate from any sound part of the *Catholic Church*, that does not

Pag.

require *unlawful* Conditions of *Communion*, and such as are *forbidden* by that God whom we Worship. Upon this *Hypothesis*, I think it impossible for the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* to defend themselves against the Charge of *Schism* in its most *rigorous* and *formal* Notion.

First, Because they separate from all Churches *Ancient* and *Modern*, there is not now a Church upon *Earth* with whom they think they may *Communicate* without *fear* of being *polluted*. The Protestants of *France* observe the *Festivals* of the Church, as also the Protestants of *Geneve* and *Switzerland*, and the *Calvinists* in *Germany* do the same. As for the *Lutherans* of *Germany*, *Denmark*, and *Swedenland*, we dare not so much as once name them, they have all of them *Liturgies* and *Festivals*, and *Organs*, and *Divine Hymns*, distinct from the *Psalms* of *David*. As for the *Socinians* of *Poland*, though they agree in some things with them; yet they would no doubt refuse their *Communion*. They must refuse, upon their *Principles*, the *Communion* of the *Grecian* Church, and all the *Subdivisions* of it: and they cannot joyn with the *Papists*, nor yet with the Church of *England*. And their *Consciences* could not endure to *Communicate* with the *Episcopal* Church of *Scotland*, that was against their *Covenants*, and their *Obligations*, as if a man could disingage himself from what he is obliged to, by the *Common Ties* of *Christianity*, and the *Vows* of *Baptism*, by any *Bond* or *posterior Obligation* of his own.

But if there be no *visible Church* with which they can *Communicate*, they are certainly cut off from the *visible Communion* of *Saints* over the *Habitable World*; and this *Pharisaical singularity* is so much the more hateful, that it is abhorred by all *Protestant Churches*, and if the *Vindicator* will Read *Durellus* only, he will easily see how *opposite* this *peevishness* is to the *Sentiments* and *Practice* of all *Reformed Churches*. It is acknowledged by all sober men, that to joyn with, or abet *Schismatics*, makes one guilty of *Schism*: and therefore the *Presbyterians* can by no means require the *Members* of the *Episcopal Church*, to joyn with them, who have *wilfully* and *furiously* cut themselves off from the *whole Body* of *Christians*: but there is lately found out a wise *Distinction* to save them from this blow, they can have *occasional Communion* with *other Churches*, tho they cannot have a *fixt Communion* with them.

Before I consider this *Distinction*, let me inform you that the *Ringleaders* of the former *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* never made use of any such *Distinction*, they themselves reasoned against *Separation* upon such frivolous pretences as are now alledged by their *Successors*; but the *Presbyterians* have borrowed this *Distinction* from *English Dissenters*. And the former *Presbyterians* did never separate from the *Publick Worship* under the *Episcopal Constitution*; nor did the latter *Presbyterians* after the *Restoration*, dream of it until the year

Vid. Rutherford's
Due right of Pres-
bytery.

Collection of Cases
against Dissenters,
by the Clergy of
London.

1664. that some of the *Western Bigots*, as had fled to *Holland*, thought that the *Faction* could not be supported unless People were taught that they were obliged to leave the *Communion* of the *Episcopal Church* intirely. And accordingly in *Ann. 1664.* there appeared a *Seditious Pamphlet* in *Octavo*, Entitled, *The Apologetical Relation of the Church of Scotland.* And it is impossible for any *Presbyterian* to name any one Book or Treatise before this Pamphlet, that justified the *Separation* of *Presbyterians* from the *Publick Reformed Worship* under the *Episcopal Constitution* in the *Church of Scotland.* It is a long time since I Read this Book, and therefore I cannot give a particular account of it, though I remember that the Author when he comes to *this Conclusion*, that the *People* were not to bear the *Curates*, he speaks with *diffidence* and *hesitation*, and in some one place or other of that Dispute he softens this *wild and extravagant Paradox* by some *restrictions* and *limitations.* That they were not to bear them always nor constantly, but that they ought so far to separate as to keep the Party from being swallowed up in the *Communion* of the *Church.* Accordingly, their first *Essays* of *Schism* were but *faint* and *timorous*, they were not in the beginning so well armed against the *Remorse* of their *own Consciences*, for this was a *Novelty*, and they did not venture upon it with that *boldness* and *assurance* that afterward appear'd, to that degree that our *Governors* were forced to make severe *Laws* against their *Field Meetings*, which were justly termed by our *Law* the *Rendezvouze* of *Rebellion.* And though the *Bigots* in the *West* had advanced this *Paradox*, yet the *Presbyterians* of greatest *Note* and *Learning* took no notice of it, but kept the *Communion* of the *Church* after the *Restoration* of *Episcopacy* as *punctually* as any *Church-man.* And it is very observable that all the *Presbyterian Ministers* in *Scotland*, made use of the *Christian Forms* of the *Lords Prayer*, *Creed*, and *Doxology*, until *Olivers Army* invaded *Scotland*, and the *Independent Chaplains* in that *Army* thought their *own Dispensation* was above that of *Geneva.* Upon this, such of the *Presbyterians* as would recommend themselves to the *Usurper*, and such as had his *Ear*, forbore those *Forms* in the *Publick Worship*, and by degrees they fell into *desuetude* (for it was not *Creditable* to be out of the *Fashion*) and yet they have the *Confidence* to justify their *Separation* from the *Episcopal Church*, partly because such *Christian Forms* are retained in the *Publick Worship.* And though they dispute against the use of *Forms*, yet they pronounce the *Apostolick Benediction* after *Sermon*, as others do, except some few who love rather to *Paraphrase* it, than keep to its *Original simplicity.* The *unhappy temper* of *Schismatics* leads them to do every thing against the *Spirit* and *Practice* of the *Church* ;

Vid. *Defence of King Charles II. Government* by S.G.M.

Mr. Ro. Douglas, Mr. Geo. Hutchinson, Mr. Sam. Rutherford, Mr. J. W. and many others.

These *Christian Forms* were rejected by *Bastard Presbyterians* that grew upon the *Independent Stock.*

and though the *Canonical* and *Universal* Methods of the Church are tempered with regard to our *weakness* and *infirmities*, yet they love to fly in the Face of their *Mother*, when she tenderly binds up their Wounds, and offers her Assistance to prevent their *Ruin* and *Danger*.

I have almost forgot to enquire into the meaning of that distinction of *occasional* and *fixed* Communion. Why may not one do that *constantly* (since the Common Tyes of Christianity oblige him) that he may do *occasionally*? But if the meaning be that their Consciences allow them now and then to hear an *Episcopal* Presbyter Preach, or Read, though they dare not venture upon the *highest* Acts of *Communion*, such as receiving of the *Lords Supper*, at this rate they may have *this occasional* Communion with *Papists*, *Grecians*, *Jews*, and *Mahumetans*, for they all teach some great and common Truths which they dare not *refuse*.

But secondly, It is apparent that the *Scots* Presbyterians are *Schismatics* in the *strictest* Sense, because by their *Principles* they must needs profess, that if they had lived one hundred and fifty years before the first Council of *Nice*, there was then a necessity to *separate* from the *Unity* of the Church. For *then* all those things that they scruple at in the *Publick* Worship were *practised* by the *Universal* Church, the *Solemnities*, and *Festivities*, the *Publick* Fasts, the *Altars*, the *Hierarchy* of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*. Nay, the *Dignity* of *Metropolitans* is supposed as *Ancient* and *Venerable* by the *first* Council of *Nice*. So upon the *Presbyterian Hypothesis*, they should have been obliged if they had lived amongst the *Ancients* then, to keep up distinct and separate *Conventicles*, when the *Purity* of their Lives, and the *Glory* of *Martyrdom*, and *Patience*, made them shine to the *Confusion* of their *Enemies*, when their *Zeal* for God made them *victorious* over all the Powers of *Darkness*, when by their *Fastings* and their *Prayers*, they *crucified* the *Flesh* with all its *Lusts* and *Affections*, when they taught the *Gospel* in its *Majesty*, and *Simplicity*, and *basted* the *Objection* of the *Pagans* by their heavenly *Conversation*. Let my Soul be with those *first* Christians, I would chuse their Company at all *adventures*, without the least fear of either *Christmas*, *Easter*, or *Good Friday*.

But thirdly, The present Presbyterians must be *Schismatics*, by the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of their *Predecessors*. This I have touched a little before.

Fourthly, I desire the *Presbyterians* to name some *Schismatics* in the *Records* of *Ecclesiastical* History, that are now acknowledged by the *common* consent of all Churches to be *Schismatics*, and then I enquire what it was that made them *such*; and if this be not agreeable to the *Presbyterians* more *eminently*, than to any rank of the *ancient Schismatics*, I am mistaken.

But fifthly, They themselves do not deny (nor can they) but that they are *Schismatics* in *St. Cyprian's* Notion of *Schism*, since to separate from ones own *Bishop* was a *just* and *Apostolical* Notion of *Schism*. And the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* are by so much the more *inexcusable* in that they have

have *stubbornly* and *factionously* Conspired against the Apostolical Hierarchy of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon.

The next thing that I remark, is his Censure of the Episcopal Clergy for Preaching Morality, *pag. 62. and 63.* He tells us that the Author of the Second Letter wrote, *That the Episcopal Party understand the Christian Philosophy better, and that it was never understood or preached better in Scotland, than under Episcopacy.* The *Vindicator* replies very wittily, *That he thought the Commendation of a Minister had been rather to understand Christian Divinity, than Christian Philosophy.* But softly, Sir, I do not see that nice distinction between *Christian Divinity*, and *Christian Philosophy*; for if Philosophy be truly Christian, it must be refined upon no *lower Standard* than the *Morals* that our Saviour *practised*, and *recommended*; and is not this *Christian Divinity* in its *Nature and Tendency*? The Author of that Letter did not understand by *Philosophy*, the *lame and defective Systems* of the *Pagans*, but rather that *Heavenly and Spiritual Rule* delivered by our Saviour. I hope he has not the Impudence to accuse the Clergy that they recommended the *Pagan Morals* as a *perfect Rule of Life* to their Hearers; or that they themselves did neither believe nor exhort others to believe the *Mysteries of Faith*, the *Credends* of our Religion. It may be they did fortify some excellent *Arguments* among the *Philosophers* with *Christian Motives*, and what the Philosophers (who spoke of the *Immortality of the Soul* with *diffidence* and *hesitation*) could not recommend but faintly: the *Christian Preachers* did assert boldly, since the *Resurrection of our Saviour from the Dead*, was an *invincible and infallible Argument*, not only of our *Resurrection*, but of the *Glory* that shall afterwards be revealed. There is nothing truly excellent among the *Pagan Writers*, but what is in one place or other for the Matter found in the *New Testament*, and *purser Morals*, and *greater heights* than the *Pagans* could discern. Nor can I think but that the *Preachers of the Gospel* may make very good use of *Pagan Moralists*. I always thought *Seneca* a very excellent Book, but if *Seneca* be *Christianised* (as the *Vindicator* speaks) I cannot see what fault the *Vindicator* can find with *Seneca*, or *Marcus Aurelius*, or any of our *Ancient Friends*. For certainly *Christian Morality* in its *true extent and latitude*, is nothing else but *Evangelical Obedience and Holiness*, *without which no man* Heb.

shall see God. And I believe the Author of that Letter intended no more, than that the Episcopal Clergy did *plainly and seriously* recommend to their Hearers the *Reformation of their Lives according to the Christian Standard*. And truly, Sir, (notwithstanding the *Vindicator's Sarcasitic Paraphrase*, I think this is very good Philosophy, nay more, I think Moral Philosophy never arrived at its true *Elevation and Meridian Purity*, but by the *Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles*; and does the *Vindicator* know better Philosophy than what is taught in the *Sermon upon the Mount*, and in the *12th. to the Romans*, we Preach that the *Wisdom* which

which is from above is pure, peaceable, gentle, and easie to be entreated, full of mercy, and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisie, we Preach that a man endowed with knowledge, should shew out of a good Conversation, his Works with meekness of Wisdom. We Preach That if any seem to be religious, and bridletb not his Tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that this mans Religion is vain, because true Religion, and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the Fatherless, and Widow, in their Afflictions, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. We Preach that the Grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness, and worldly Lults, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world. And truly, Sir, I think this very good Morality, and the rather because we fortifie our Exhortations, with the same motives that the Apostles used, and with which the Pagan Philosophers could not be acquainted. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good Works. It is very true that the Pagan Philosophers Preached against Lust and Sensualities, and Uncleanness; but could they recommend Chastity by such powerful and invincible motives as you meet with, 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. What, know you not that your bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorifie God in your body and your spirit which are Gods. And without all doubt S. Paul recommended to the Philippians the true use of the Moral Philosophers, when he exhorts Phil. 4. 8. Finally Brethren whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any vertue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. Compare this with the place on the Margin, and hundreds of such places, and from them I conclude, that to Preach what the Moral Philosophers commended (though we must Preach many things that they could not see) and to strengthen them by Christian Motives is a thing very becoming the Ministers of the Gospel: because it is indispensably necessary and agreeable to the Practice of our Saviour, and his Apostles. But the Vindicator tells us, Pag. 62. That this is the dialect of men strongly enclin'd to Socinianism. I let go this mark of his spite and ill nature, for we have no Socinians amongst the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland. And if he understands the Socinians, they are not so very zealous for Celebrating the Festival of Christs Nativity and Incarnation; nor yet are they great Enemies to Presbyterian Government, nor can they be thought zealous for any particular

particular Platform (were it never so agreeable to the Canons of the Ancient Church) any further than their *interest* is involv'd. He tells us a little after, that the *preaching of some men is such morality*, as Seneca and other Heathens taught, *only Christianised* with some words; so the *Vindicator* thinks that the *morality* they recommended to their Hearers was neither *higher* nor *purer* than the *Doctrines* of Seneca and other *Stoicks*; But it may be that they have read Seneca with as much *attention* as he did, and can give as good an *account* of the *Defects* of the *Stoical Philosophy*, and wherein it fell short of the *Christian Standard*: One may easily guess whom he means, and intends to hit by this waspish accusation. But to pursue him thorow all his *hiding* places, and little *Subterfuges*, is as *useless* as it is *wearisom*. The reason why I kept you so long on this Head, was to discover the *Genius* of the people we have to do with. He tells us, *this Philosophy was never much preached by the Presbyterians*: but the Philosophy that I have describ'd was preach'd by S. Paul, and consequently not *opposite* unto the Doctrine of Christ crucified (as he fancies) but rather *subservient* unto it, and a great *confirmation* of the truth and *divinity* of it; It is very true, that the Princes of Philosophers understood not the *Revelations* of the Gospel, but the *true exercise* of Reason is very *consistent* with Revelation; and S. Paul's discourse to the *Athenian* proves him a *learned and solid* Philosophér. And tho the Apostles were *mean* and *illiterate* men, yet God did strengthen their Reason beyond the most *accurate Philosophers*: And when he sent them forth to preach the Gospel, they became in the strictest sense *greater Philosophers* than their Enemies. And tho the Christian Religion in its *beginnings* appeared *weak* and *foolish*, yet when it was *narrowly enquired* into, it was found to be the *wisdom of God*, and the *power of God*: for the Apostles offer'd the best Reasons to *convince* both *Jew* and *Gentile*, that *Jesus of Nazareth was the Messias*; and consequently, that *there was no other name under heaven known by which men might be saved but the name of JESUS*. They proved their *Mission*, and their *Doctrine by their Miracles*; and this was an *Argument divine*, and *irrefragable* in its *nature*; as it was *obvious* and plain to the *meanest Capacity*, and therefore the Author to the *Hebrews* concludes, that the *damnation of Infidels* is the most just and reasonable thing, because *infidelity* it self is most *inexcusable*, since God did bear witness to the Gospel by *signs, and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the holy Ghost*. True Philosophy * and Religion support one ano-

1 Cor. 1. 23, 24.

Acts 17.

Acts. 2.

Hebr. 2 3, 4.

* Vid. Justin Mar. Dialog. cum tryph.

ther. None can be truly religious but he that exercises his Reason, and he that exercises his reason must of necessity be religious. For the whole of our Religion is a reasonable service; God treats us as reasonable Creatures; he makes himself Master of our Will, by methods suitable to his wisdom and our nature; when the light of the Gospel enters the Soul and warms it by its direct beams and perpendicular rays, she then chuses what is best with all her force and delight.

It is certain, that if the Moral Philosophers could lay aside their pride and the interest of a Faction, they might be sooner gained to Christianity than others, they could not but see the beauty and reasonableness of such excellent Morals as were recommended in the Gospel, and were far above the lame and defective systems of the Pagan Schools. There are no excellent Precepts amongst the Pagans, but what are contained in the New Testament; and if we recommend Christian vertue by Christian motives, I think the whole undertaking is very commendable. Why the Vindicator should thus waspishly Comment on an innocent Sentence or two of that Author, I cannot tell; but he may remember that when we were Boys we were taught that Philosophy in its utmost extent and latitude, was the knowledge of divine and human things. And then Christian Philosophy is good Christian Divinity & vice versa; but the Vindicator is afraid lest any one may think him a stranger to Philosophy, and therefore tells us, that it may be that they understand that as well; as their Neighbours. And no doubt this Paragraph of his, that I have examined, is a sufficient Evidence of his Philosophical skill and knowledge.

Such another Specimen of his Candour and Ingenuity we meet with pag 66. where he again insinuates, that the Clergy are Socinians, &c. The Author of the second Letter had justly observed, that the Clergy could not be erroneous, because they could sign the 39 Articles of the Church of England. But the Vindicator replies, So can many do who every day preach against the Doctrine contained in these Articles. And at this rate he may disprove all external Evidences: there is no penetrating into the hearts of men, they are only accessible to Omniscience to whom all things are naked and open. But the Vindicator may remember, that the dissenting Ministers in and about London in their late agreement, require no more of any as marks of Orthodoxy, than the subscription of 36 Articles. The Vindicator insinuates, that though the Clergy do subscribe them, yet they preach against them. This is another stroke of his good Nature and Civility; and he may be convinced long

ere now, that the Episcopal Clergy is not so very pliable to do any thing against their Convictions in view of their worldly Interest, even when he and his Party have been very *active* to reduce them to extraordinary straits and difficulties; nay, if he will oblige me to be plain, I could tell him, where some Ministers of that Faction were so villainously zealous against the Clergy, that they did sollicit Witnesses against them, where they themselves, or some of their intimate Brethren were Judges. I am not to publish Names, but I can prove this whenever it is found convenient. I know the Vindicator will be very curious to know my Informers, but I am not obliged to be so particular, though I am resolved by Gods assistance to perform all the promises I make to him and his Associates.

But the next Censure that he bestows on the Clergy is of the same nature with the former. The Author of the second Letter had said, that there were many among the Clergy who were not inclined to be every day talking to the people of Gods decrees and absolute reprobation, &c. Indeed, I think the Author gave a just account of the prudence and modesty of his Brethren, but the Vindicator lashes him here with great severity, and tells him that his discourse is impertinent; for they do not require that one should talk always to the people of Decrees and Reprobations. But here the Vindicator gives no great proof of his Logick. For the phrase, every day did not imply a Metaphysical strictness, as if the Presbyterians never preach'd on any other Subject but on the absolute Decrees and Reprobation; but the plain and obvious meaning is, that Presbyterians did frequently and indiscreetly handle such abstruse Subjects, as neither they nor the people were able to fathom. And all such Phrases, though they seem to imply a Logical universality must be interpreted, to intend no more, than that such or such a thing frequently comes to pass.

The next Blow is more severe, and one had need
 to be armed Capa-pee to meet with it, But if he mean
 (as he must if he speak to the purpose) that the absolute decrees of Election and Reprobation, both prateritum as an act of Sovereignty, and pradamnatum as an act of Justice, are not to be held forth or taught to the people; we abhor this as an unsound Doctrine, and look on him as a pitiful Advocate for the Orthodoxy of the Clergy. Thus the Vindicator is sufficiently revenged of his Adversary, who is now more lamentably shattered than can be imagined; It is not generous in the Vindicator thus to pursue his Victory; is it possible that such meek and calm Saints shall thus openly expose the weakness of their Antagonists. But if the Vindicator were out of his passion, I would entreat him to tell me in what place of Saint Paul's Epistles does he read of a Decretum pradam

Pag. 66.

Virg. Æneid. 1.—
 Tantane animis
 celestibus in c.

natum, and what ever come of the *Calvinian* or *Arminian Hypothesis*; I am afraid his Explication is both complicated *Nonsense* and *Blasphemy*. But he tells us, that he understands Philosophy as well as his Neighbors; pray, let him tell us in which of the *Schoolmen* or *Protestant Calvinists* did he ever read of a *Decretum prædammatum*? *præteritio* and *prædammatio* may be met with, but a *Decretum prædammatum* is the peculiar invention of this * Philosopher.

* Tully *de nat. deorum*, lib. 3. *nihil tam absurdum quod non dixerit aliquis philosophorum.*

The Decree is the *Act* of God, and there is no *act* of his can be condemned. Such an *unfortunate Blunder* as this is was never before seen in print; and yet the *Vindicator* must tell us, *that such things must be held forth to the people*, and in imitation

of *Saint Paul* too. Truly, I think they had as good not be *held forth*, but hid and laid up in the boundless Registers of *Chimera's*, *Non-entities*, and *Negations*. I think this *Decretum prædammatum* may keep company with such ancient Gentlemen of its own *kindred and Family*; and ought not at all to be *held forth* to the people. And if you be acquainted with the *Vindicator*, you may advise him to read the *Calvinian Hypothesis* before he venture to explain it. And perhaps there are some about him who may expose his explication of the *decrees* as much as they do his *Latin reasonings* against *Idolatry*.

The next thing I take notice of is his historical Argument from the *Culdees*, to prove that there was a *Presbyterian Church* in *Scotland* in the *primitive* times before *Poperly* entred. And the plain truth is, this is the only thing that he says, that deserves to be considered, not for any weight or *historical Truth* that is in it, but because the *learned Blondel* made use of it to support that *imaginary Hypothesis* from some *Ancient Testimonies*. He had met with it in *Buchanan's History*, and that learned Historian took it unwarily from his *Contemporary Monks*, *Boetius* and others, or such as were little removed from his *own Age*; *Blondel* made use of it to serve the *dissenting Interest* in *Britain*. And to the end that he might make a great *muster* of *Testimonies*, he must needs erect

Apolog. pro sententia Hieronymi, p 315.

a *Presbyterian Church* in *Scotland* towards the *end* of the *second Century*, or *beginning* of the *third*. If they can prove this, I must confess it is of *considerable weight*; but the great *misfortune* is, there are no *Authors* now extant upon whose *Testimony* an affair so distant from our times can be reasonably *founded*. None within six hundred years of that *Period* gives us the least evidence for it, when I say six hundred years, I do not mean, that good *Authors* at the distance of seven or eight hundred years give any *Evidence* for it more than their *Predecessors*; but when there is none to *vouch* it within that *Period*, it is *ridiculous*

to impose it as a piece of true *History*. And our *Vindicator* tells us, that tho' the *Presbyterian* Government continue for some Ages in the Church of *Scotland* before they had *Bishops*: Can he name any Church upon Earth that embrac'd the Christian Religion, and yet none to write the affairs of their own time for some Ages together? But if the writings of those ancient *Presbyterians* are *lost*; Are there no *fragments* of them preserved in the writings of *succeeding* Ages? There were no people so ignorant as the *Monks* for some *Centuries* before the *Reformation*; and yet there was nothing that they were so ignorant in as true *Ecclesiastical History*. And if they had been the most learned and accurate, what could they help themselves in an affair of this nature when they had no certain *Records* by which they might transmit the knowledge of former times to *Posterity*. No tradition of that Antiquity can be preserved without *writing*; why then do they obtrude this *fabulous* Story, since it cannot be received by any known rules of *Credibility*, we have no *vestige* of it from any Author that lived near those times. The *Vindicator* uses to refer us in some Instances to his own little *Books*, I do him a greater kindness when I refer him to the Learned *Du Launoy*, and from several Treatises and reasonings of his (which now I have not at command) he may learn by what *Rules* to distinguish *fabulous* Accounts from true and *solid* History, and not only from him but from hundreds, if they do but argue from principles of common sense, and the acknowledg'd rules of *Logick*. * Indeed, the *Presbyterians* might have given us some of the Acts of their *Assemblies*, in that ancient Period, and the rules of *Discipline*, as well as obtrude upon us this *Romanick* Account. And if I dare interpose my *Opinion*, I think that the late illiterate *Monks* advanc'd this *Fable* to gratifie the *Pope's* design, of exempting the religious Orders from *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, by which *Engine* the *Bishops* were kept low, and the *Reformation* hindered, and the religious Orders encouraged, to check their Authority in all places. This is so known, that it needs neither *proof* nor *illustration*; and this *Piction* of the *Culdees* governing a Church without the authority of a *Bishop*, invented in the days of *Barbarism* and *Superstition*, seems naturally calculated

Pag 3. Vindicat.

The Antiquity of our Nation does not depend on any such Monkish Legend, but may very well stand on its former grounds, and such collateral proofs as may be borrowed from the Roman Historians. Vid. Macken. Defence of the Royal Line.

Du Launoy.

* Logica Clerici parte secunda de judicis. Deficientibus omnibus historicis monumentis historia gentis alicujus cognosci nequit, nec quidquam verum nisi casu de eadici. Quot conjecturae inanes circa historiam sacram & Ecclesiasticam, quasi certae afferuntur quae multo majorem historiarum requirerent lucem, si de his quidquam certi statuendum esset?

culated to advance this Design, and to depress the Episcopal Jurisdiction. For the Monks that propagated this Story, were more *conversant* in little *Legends*, than the Writings of the Ancients. And hardly is there any thing more opposite to the *Universal Testimony*, and *simplicity* of those Ages, than this *Menkish Fable of Presbyterian Government*, towards the end of the *Second Century*, or the beginnings of the *Third*, when all the known Records of the Christian Church *unanimously* declare for the *Hierarchy* of *Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon*, and the *Succession* of Bishops from the *Apostles*.

* *Tullius pro Archia Poeta? Atque is tamen (Alexander) cum in Sigæo ad Achillis tumulum astrisset. O fortunate, inquit, adolescens qui tue virtutis Homerum preconem inveneris! Et verè, nam nisi illis illa exstitisset idem tumulus qui corpus ejus contexerat nomen etiam obruisset.*

It is not possible to preserve the memory of the *greatest men**, the *greatest Conquests*, or the *most remarkable Actions*, unless they are *timeously* committed to writing. *Unwritten Tradition* goes but a short way, and is not able to *support* it self with any certainty, for any number of years. Is it likely that the *Scottish Church* had any other *Ecclesiastical Government* than what was received in the *Christian Church* when they were *converted* to the Faith?

and is it not very sad that there are no *parallel Instances* of any other Church from abroad? By whom were they *converted*? And is it not reasonable to think that such as were *instrumental* in their *Conversion*, would plant the *Ecclesiastical Government* amongst them that they were acquainted with themselves? And are there any *footsteps* of such a Government amongst the more *polite* and *learned Nations*, who because they had the *Advantages of learning*, might sooner transmit to *Posterity* the *Knowledge* of their *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. And let me ask the *Presbyterians*, if they had all the *Testimonies* of the *Ancients* in favours of their *parity*, and that we only had the *Authority* of some *fabulous Monks* in some *remote Corner* of the *World* to *support* our *Hierarchy*, and that in an *Age of shameful Ignorance*, and *Darkness*, when they *imposed* upon *mankind*, and *multiplied* their *visionary Legends*. I ask, how the *Vindicator* would treat us if we appeared with our *Culdees* against the *undoubted Records* of the *Fathers*, the *Universal Suffrages of Councils*, the *Succession* of the famous *Sees*, and the *glorious Cloud* of *Witnesses*, that by their *Zeal* and *Sufferings* enlightened the *World*? I think he would treat us very *buffingly*, and let us hear more than once his oft repeated and beloved *Metaphor of the Seed of the Serpent, and the Seed of the woman*. Would not he tell us of our *bold* and *silly pretences* to *Antiquity*. However when the *Vindicator* names good *Authors foreign* or *domestick* in the *third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh Century* (and this is more than by the *Rules of Credibility* or *History* we need yield to him) then it is time to consider his *Testimonies*. Let him

I. *Vindicat. Preface.*

Read *Blondel* again, and see whether that *great Antiquary*

Apolog. pro Sentent. Hieron.

quary can name any Ancient Writer to uphold this *Monastick Dream*. But if I should grant that there had been some Priests in *Scotland* before there were Bishops in it, there is nothing in that *Concession* to favor *Presbytery*; for they had their *Mission* and *Ordination* from *Bishops* in other places to whom they might give an account of their *Travels* and *Success*, and this was ordinary before Nations were *Converted*. But when they received the Faith, all *Ecclesiastical Officers* were then encouraged to continue amongst them, and this is it that we confidently affirm, that where there are any Records of Nations and Countries *Converted* to the Faith, there do we meet with the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon*, over the whole Christian Church. The Primitive Confessors and Martyrs Travailed the World over to gain Profelytes to *Christianity*, some *Bishops*, some *Presbyters*, some *Deacons*, some *Lay-men*; but wherever there was any considerable number of *Converts*, then they became an *Organical Church*, and had *Bishops* and *Presbyters* *Constituted*, until their sound went unto all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

Rom. 10. 18.

Pag. 184.

He runs down the Author of the History of the General Assembly as one, not acquainted with the *Actings* of Grace in the Soul, because forsooth he had not spoke with reverence enough of *Mr. Gray's Sermons*, in that Page cited on the Margin.

Pag. 185.

The *Vindicator* discovers much of his own creeping Genius, when he discourses of the Act of their Assembly against the *private Administration* of *Baptism*, nor is it possible to pursue him in such a Wilderness of little impertinencies.

Their *pretended Assembly* would have done better if they had left the Administration of *Baptism* to the *discretion* of *Ministers* in all places, it is certainly much to be wished, that *Baptism* be Administred with all *publick Solemnity*, when there is not an apparent *necessity* to recede from so laudable a Custom, but to make Discourses to the People on particular Texts of Scripture, at the Administration of *Baptism*, is a thing in it self altogether new and unnecessary. If the *nature, use, and design* of it, be seriously explained, there needs no more. And to think a Sermon, in the modern and usual Notion, necessary is as great Superstition, as that of theirs, who fancy that the effects of it follow *ex opere operato*, which *Phrase* is very little understood by the People, and perhaps others who should teach the People do not thoroughly understand it neither.

Next I shall take notice of what we are told by the *Vindicator* Pag. 174. That the *Presbyterians* could not comply with *Human Ceremonies* with a good *Conscience* in the *Worship* of God *. It is true, the *Vindicator* hath not in this place any Discourse to the *Worship* of God when there were no Ceremonies appointed.

* But they refused to joyn in the Wor-

prove this unlawful, but I take notice of it as one of the *Theological hints* that are interspersed in his *Defamatory Libel*. But may not Ceremonies of *Human Appointment* (if they decently and gravely express our *Affections*) be used in the *Worship of God*? Did not *Solomon* advise us to look to our Feet when we come into the house of God, and the same Ceremony was practised under the *Patriarchal Dispensation*, viz. That of putting off our Shoes when we approach the Holy Place: as *Moses* was enjoyed by God himself, because the place he stood upon was holy ground, and this was an Advertisement that he ought to do what was ordinarily done by all the *Eastern Nations* when he approached the place of Gods peculiar Residence. And pray, Was it not a significant Ceremony expressive of their Reverence and adoration? In like manner, Sackcloth and Ashes did amongst all Nations signify grief and sorrow, therefore in their *Humiliations* they were used to express their Remorse and Contritions. The *Presbyterians* fix upon a word, and pronounce it with disdain and contempt, they repeat it with Indignation, and then their zealous Disciples when they hear that word pronounced, presently let fly their thoughts to some monstrous thing or other that is not at all signified by that word; yet the Idea of some such ugly thing sticks to their Imagination, for no other reason but that *Mas John* frown'd when he heard that word pronounced. What other reason can we give why the word (significant Ceremony) should disturb their Imaginations? Why may not we express our Thoughts, Passions, and Affections by Ceremonies as well as by words? Since both are innocent, and both serve the same design. But the Covenanters themselves used significant Ceremonies, when they imposed the Covenant: he that Swore was to lift up his right hand bare, you are to take notice that it was the Right and not the Left, and it was lifted up and not otherwise extended. It was bare, and not covered, and was not this a significant Ceremony of Human Institution?

In the *Worship of God*, nature taught Mankind to approach God with all the decent Marks of Distance and Adoration, and they that declaim most against Ceremonies, do practice them frequently, only they do this more awkwardly, and with a figure becoming their singularity; but this will never convince the Intelligent part of Mankind that they are either wiser or better than any of their Neighbours. True Religion obliges us to comply with the innocent decencies of Mankind, and to affect nothing that's extraordinary or singular. Our Saviour left us this Example; he eat and drank with Publicans and Sinners, and affected no Customs different from the Jews. If the Ceremonies be practised by the Nation amongst whom we live, if they decently express our Reverence, or our Humiliation, I see no reason why they may not be used in the Service of God, as well as words, especially when they are commanded by our lawful Superiours as necessary Instruments of Publick Order and Uniformity, nor can they change their Nature by being commanded; for such and such Ceremonies are in their Nature

ture *indifferent*, yet some one or other must be used, and which of them we shall use may very well be determined by our lawful *Superiors*. Sitting (for any thing I know) was never looked upon as a Posture of *Reverence*, yet the Presbyterians in *Scotland*, for the most part sit all of them in time of Publick Prayer, what they *signifie* by it I know not, I am sure not that which becomes Prayer, and the Worship of the most High God. We look upon the decent Ceremonies of the Church as *Appendages* or Expressions, but not constituent parts of Worship, as is *foolishly* and *peevishly* alledged by our *Adversaries*; and I may put the *Vindicator* in mind, that the reason why some of the Clergy in *Scotland* Read the Book of *Common-Prayer*, is not what he *suggests*, according to his wonted Candor and Ingenuity, but rather an open *avowing* of their *Principles*, when it was visible to the World there was no *possibility* of uniting with the *Presbyterians*.

Another thing I take notice of, is to be met with *Pag. 196, 197*. The Author of that Epistle, that is subjoyned to the *Vindicators* Book, tells us, to the reproach of our *Bishops*, that some of them upon the *Restoration* of the Government submitted to *reordination* to the great scandal not only of this, but other Reformed Churches. I know none were scandalized at it, but such as were resolved to pick quarrels with every thing that the Bishops would do. It was no scandal to the *Foreign Churches* or the *French Divines*. All of them the *greatest* men among them are *reordained* when they come to *England*, and they cheerfully submit to it. And this was never condemned by any Publick Act of the *Gallican Church*, nor by none of their Eminent Divines. The Church of *England* does not absolutely condemn their *Ordinations* in *France*, but rather waves the *debate*: but she is determined to preserve an *unquestionable succession* of *Priests* within her own Bounds.

As to the Matter of Fact narrated in Mr. *Meldrum's* Letter I know nothing of it, and therefore I ought to say no more than I know. He tells us that he subscribed a Paper, and that the Paper was *drawn* out of the *Archbishops* Letter by a Friend of his, and that now he repents for *Subscribing* this Paper, and that though he was in great Friendship afterwards with *Bishop Scougal*, and did what others in that *Interval* did, yet he thinks that by all this he paid no *formal* Canonical Obedience. From all which I observe, that it is a very happy thing to live in, or near an *University* as Mr. *Meldrum* did. Distinctions are *very useful things*, one had better carry a good bundle of them about him than all your famous *Elixirs* and *Essences*; one may pay *material* Canonical Obedience, but it is dangerous to pay it *formally*: the great mischief is in the *formality* of paying it, but for my part I have sworn Canonical Obedience *formally*, and I have paid it *materially*, and shall never decline my Bishops Spiritual Authority when ever there is occasion, and I think all the *Presbyters* of that National Church are as much obliged to obey their Spiritual Governours, notwithstanding of all

M. Alix, and many others.

that pass in favours of the opposite Faction since the *Revolution*. And now I think it high time to go forward to the fourth Particular that I promised, *viz.*

To let you see the several Periods of Episcopacy and Presbytery in the Church of *Scotland* since the Reformation. And I am the more confident to give you satisfaction, because I had the happiness to peruse a Manuscript (written by a person of *great honour and true Learning*) relating to this very affair; and it is of so much the greater *weight and Authority*, that it is not only founded on our best Historians, but on the *authentick Records* of Parliament; and it is from that Manuscript that I *copy* the following Account: for it is apparent that the Church was never governed by a Parity of Officers, but by different Orders from the beginning of the Reformation. And in the entry to this Narration, Let us remark, says *my Author*, 'That none of our Martyrs did ever *impugn* or oppose *imparity* in the Church, or preach or write against it; you cannot name one Testimony, unless you argue from their preaching against Popish Tyranny and unwarrantable exercise of Ecclesiastical Power, to infer that they were for (the then unheard of) *Parity*, and all who write of those *Martyrs* and first *Reformers*, omit not to praise them for their dutiful *submission* to their Bishops and Superiours. And it is very probable these Martyrs would have preached against Ecclesiastical Tyranny as well in a Company of Arbitrary Presbyters, as they did when it was lodged in one or few; and that Presbyters may be Tyrants, witness the *Scots History* from the year 1639 to 1652. At which time *Cromwel* (tho no Friend to Episcopacy) was so *wearied* with the *Insolencies and Confusions* of *Presbytery*, that he dismissed it solemnly at *Barrow-Moor*.

'Let us now come to positive Evidences. The very first established Reformation in *Scotland*, was that which on the 6th of *July* 1560 (being the third day after the pacification at *Leith*) was concluded on, betwixt the Lords and Ministers of the *Congregation* assisted by the *Queen of Englands General and Ambassador* on the one side. And the *Queen Regent*, the *popish Lords*, and *Clergy*, assisted by the *French Ambassador* on the other side, in name of *Francis and Mary* their Sovereigns. The Protestant Lords and Clergy did meet, at *Edenburgh*, the Protestants preached in the *Churches* and in their Assembly they did distribute their Preachers among the Chief Towns of the *Nation*, and did *nominate* five *Superintendents* for the *Dioceses*, where the Bishops were *popish*. For there are no *Superintendents* named then for *Galloway and Argyle*, because the Bishops of those *Dioceses* were *Protestants*.

Spotwood, *Am.*
1560. pag. 149. and
Knox in his *Hist.*
1560. pag. 264 sets
down at length the
form of Electing the
Superintendents.

By the said Treaty a Parliament was to hold in *August* following, wherein the Confession of Faith drawn up by the *Superintendents* was given in to the Lords of the Articles, prepared by them, and Voted in Parliament, where it was carried in the *Affirmative*. In this Parliament the Bishops did sit as the first *Estate*. The popish Bishops voted against the *Confession*, the Protestant Bishops, *viz.* *Galloway* and *Argile*, and three *Abbots* voted for it. The *Sederunt* of this Parliament is on Record with its Acts, and related by *Spotswood*, pag. 149.

In *January* thereafter, the *Scottish Protestant Clergy* offer a form of Church Policy; one of its Heads is for *Superintendents*, whom they name, and appoint, with distinct *Dioceses* for them, and to shew that these Reformers did not treat of *Superintendents* as a temporary Resolution for *that time only*; It is there said, that the *Election* of *Superintendents*, in aftertimes should be *stricter* than the present *circumstances* would allow; and the last Head of that Policy prescribes some Conditions to be kept in *future Elections* of *Superintendents*. *Spotswood*, pag. 150 and 160, and by the book of Policy, pag. 168. it is expressly ordered, that Complaints against Ministers be notified to the *Superintendents*. And the Petition presented to the Queen, related by *Knox Hist.* pag. 337. bears, as the superscription of the *Superintendents*, Ministers of the whole Church of *Scotland*, to the Queens Majesty, &c. And in the year 1563. *John Knox* and others elected a *Superintendent* for *Dumfries*, and the Letter written from the Assembly or Convention of the *Scots Church* at *Edenburgh* on the 27. of *December*, 1566. to the Church of *England* bears this Superscription. The *Superintendents*, Ministers, and Commissioners of the Church within the Realm of *Scotland* to their Brethren, the Bishops and Pastors of *England*. And at Queen *Mary's* first arrival in *Scotland* from *France*, the *Superintendents* and Ministers did meet at *Edenburgh* in an Assembly, *Knox hist.* pag. 318.

In *January* 1572. the Commission of the Assembly did meet at *Leith*, under the Regents Government, and did agree on seven Articles of Policy. 1. That all Bishopricks which were *vacant* (and those were only four; for where popish Bishops were alive, the See's were not esteemed vacant, but supplied by Protestant *Superintendents*) should be filled out of the ablest of the Ministry. Secondly, That spiritual Jurisdiction should be exercis'd by Bishops in their *Dioceses*; and the sixth Article is, that Ministers should receive *Ordination* from the Bishops, and in *Dioceses* where no Bishops were, they should receive *Ordination* from the *Superintendents*. And in *August* thereafter, the General Assembly of the Church did meet at *Perth*, and approved of all these Articles; and accordingly Mr. *John Douglas*, M. *James Boyd*, Mr. *James Paton*, and Mr. *Andrew Graham*, were plac'd in the four

⁶ *vacant Bishopricks.* It was Mr. *Andrew Melvil's* misfortune that he was
⁶ neglected, and therefore in the year 1575. he stir'd up one Mr.
⁶ *Dury* to *impugne* the Episcopal Order, and all *Imparity*. This is the
⁶ first time that this *debate* was *tos'd* in our Church; and on it, *Church*
⁶ and *State* immediately *divided*, and much *Confusion*, *Rapine*, *Blood* and
⁶ other *mischiefs* did follow, and *then* and *since* every *fiery Faction* did
⁶ lay hold on this *Schism* as a fund whereon to build all *Rebellion* and
⁶ *Treason*. In prosecution of this *Schism* Mr. *Andrew* (and some Mi-
⁶ nisters led by him.) did in the year 1578. draw a Book of Policy
⁶ stuffed so with the Spirit of Mr. *Andrew* himself, that it was rather
⁶ a Proposal for the overthrow of all *just* Authority than an *Estab-*
⁶ *lishment* of a Religious Government: and therefore it could never
⁶ (no not in these distracted furious times (even when there was no
⁶ King in our *Israel*) obtain *approbation* from any Authority, but was look'd
⁶ on as a *Rapsody* of groundless Assertions, and full of *mischievous* No-
⁶ velties. Indeed, in the year 1580. an Assembly met at *Dundee*, cal-
⁶ led by Mr. *Andrew* and his Associates without a shadow of any per-
⁶ mission from the Civil Authority; and they declared that the Office
⁶ of a Bishop (but with this restriction, as it was then used) had nei-
⁶ ther *foundation* nor *warrant* in the Word of God. But let all serious
⁶ Christians consider, whether they will believe this famous Conventicle
⁶ or the plain *Scriptures*, the Doctrine of the *Apostles*, the *primitive Fathers*,
⁶ and the *Canons* of all *Oecomenick Councils*, and the rule of *Apostolick* and
⁶ *primitive* Practice, and to help their choice, let them take notice of the
⁶ pious Design of this Assembly in casting off Bishops, by the very next
⁶ clause in their Act, *viz.* That their next Assembly should consider how to
⁶ dispose of the *Patrimony* and *possessions* of Bishops. This was the primitive
⁶ Invasion of the Kings *Patronages* and *Regale* of the Crown. Then
⁶ Presbyterian Disciples began to *propagate* their *new Gospel* very *zea-*
⁶ *lously*; The first was one *Montgomery*, who at *Sterling* proposed that
⁶ all such as spoke for the Order of Bishops should be *cenfured*; but
⁶ this zealous Saint did most *basely* and *simoniacally* (shortly thereafter)
⁶ bargain with a *Nobleman* that he might be made Bishop of *Glasgow*,
⁶ and then his Co-Presbyters (who themselves were not so *successful*)
⁶ handled him to purpose; but with such *indiscretion*, that in pursuing
⁶ him they trampled on the King and all the *Civil Authority*, in so far,
⁶ that when they were called to answer for *illegal* Invasions on the
⁶ Kings Authority, they did boldly protest, that tho they *compeared* in
⁶ civility to the King, yet that they did not acknowledge the King or
⁶ Councils Right in any *Ecclesiastick* matter. This was on the 12th of
⁶ *April* 1582. And shortly thereafter in one of their Assemblies hol-
⁶ den at *St. Andrews*, Mr. *Andrew Melvil* told the *Master of Requests*
⁶ (who was sent by the King to stop some of their illegal proce-
⁶ du.es.)

'dures) that they did not meddle in Civil matters ; but in *Ecclesiastick* matters they had *sufficient* Authority to proceed, and did so.

'The practice on these grounds did shortly follow, for on the 23^d of *August* 1582. the King was made Prisoner by a *Faction* of Lords at the house of *Rutbwen*, and on the 13th of *October* 1582. the *Assembly* of the Church at *Edenburg*, did by an *Act* approve of that *perduellion*, and declared that it was *good* service to God and his Church. And in the *beginning* of *January* 1583. two *Ambassadors* came from *France*, and one from *England*, to endeavour the *Kings Liberty* ; the *Assembly* ordered the *Ministers* to declaim against the *impious Design* of liberating the *King*, and they did rail at the *Ambassadors* by name, and stirred up the *Rabble* (their faithful *Confederates* on all occasions) not to suffer the *Badge* of the *French Order* to be seen on their *Streets*, it being the *mark* of the *Beast*, a badge of *Antichrist*, and to shew their *good Manners* as well as their *sound Doctrine*, the *King* having appointed the *Magistrates* of *Edenburg* to entertain the *Ambassadors* on the 16th of *February* 1583. The *Ministers* appointed a *solemn Fast* on that very day, and civilly preached from morning till night, (a matter of no great difficulty to such as preach for such ends, and with so little rule) cursing the *Magistrates*, and their *Company*, and were with difficulty kept from *excommunicating* them.

'The *King* having delivered himself from his restraint, *Mr. Dury* and others of the *Ministry* openly assert that there was no *injury* done to the *King*, and *Mr. Melvil* declaimed frequently against the *King*, for which he was called before the *Council* ; but he boldly declaimed the *King* and *Council* as *Judges* in *prima Instantia* of what's preached in the *Pulpit*, even tho it were high *Treason*, and so he fled to *England* ; from whence he kindled that *Conspiracy*, which shortly thereafter brought the *Earl of Gowry* and others to the *Scaffold*. These *seditions* doctrines and *practices* moved the whole *Estates* of the *Kingdom* in the year 1584, on the 22^d day of *May* in a *Parliament* at *Edenburg* by a *solemn Act*, to assert the *Kings Sovereign Power* over all persons, and in all *causes* as his *undoubted ancient Right* ; and that it was *Treason* to decline his *Authority* in any matter, and discharging all *Assemblies*, *Conventions*, and all *Jurisdictions* *spiritual* or *temporal*, not allowed by the *King* and *Estates* : and prohibiting all *factious* and *sedicious Preachings*, *Sermons*, and all *slanderous Speeches* against the *King*. The *Ministers* declaimed against this and *reproached* this *Act* of *Parliament*. Notwithstanding of all this, the *King* was prevail'd with to allow *Mr. Melvil* and his *Complices* to return to their *Churches* : but no sooner had they this favour, than *Mr. Andrew* calls an *Assembly* to *St. Andrews* ; it consisted of *Presbyters* and *Laicks*, and one *Mr. Robert*

Wilky, a Regent Professor, and Laick was chosen Moderator. There in
 a most ridiculous manner they Cite the Archbishop of St. Andrews on
 twenty four hours to Compare before them (and he not *comparing*) they
 caused a young indiscreet Fellow, called Hunter, to Excommunicate him,
 for having accesson to that Act of Parliament lately mentioned, he being
 a Member of Parliament, and an Assembly meeting this very year at
 Edinburgh, would have taken up this difference, and in order thereto did
 Absolve the Archbishop from Excommunication; yet Mr. Andrew and his ad-
 herents protested against the Assembly, and declared that notwithstanding
 of their Absolution, yet the Archbishop should be still esteemed as one deli-
 vered to Satan, until signs of true Repentance appeared. And though
 upon all occasions they magnifie their Assemblies, and their pretended pa-
 rity, yet when the far major number was against their humour, they re-
 garded not their plurality. For in Anno 1591. when the Synod of
 St. Andrews had determined to constitute one Mr. Weems, Minister at Leu-
 charts, Mr. Melvil, and some few more, viz. six were for one Mr. Wallace,
 and when the far major part would not submit to his Opinion, (though
 they pretend that the Kingdom of Christ is invaded when Bishops or Princes
 oppose the majority of a Synod) yet Mr. Melvil, and his six withdraw
 to another place, and admitted Mr. Wallace to the Ministry of Leuchars,
 and the Synod did admit Mr. Weems. But this had almost engaged the
 Parishioners in Blood, and the scuffle could not be ended until Melvil's Fa-
 ction prevailed so far against the Synod, that neither of the two should be
 Minister at that Church. The Reason why I insist on this, is, to let them
 of a contrary Opinion see how justly our dislike of a parity in Church
 Offices is Founded, and that there being no imaginable warrant for it from
 Scripture, Apostolick Practice, Primitive Fathers, Councils, or any well
 Established Christian Church, and that the best plea for it, seems to be
 the pretended parity that is alledged amongst the first Reformers in Scot-
 land, we judged it fit first to shew that there was an imparity then; and al-
 ways thereafter in this Church, and that the design of parity was always
 rejected by our Kings, Parliaments, and the most, and best of our Clergy,
 and that the immoralities, and Seditions, of such as contended for parity
 gives us no invitation to be amongst their Successors.

It is true, that the King in the year 1590. and 1591. and 1592. was
 so often brought into danger, twice was he Captive, and constantly in
 great trouble by the Seditions of Mr. Andrew Melvil, and his fiery compli-
 ces, that in the year 1592. he did consent to grant a great deal of Jurisdic-
 tion to Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies by Act of Parlia-
 ment; and this of necessity to evite a threatened Rebellion, and that by the
 advice of Chancellor Maitland, who in Council advised the King to give
 them much of their will, for that was the short way to make them odious,
 as already they were troublesome to the Nation, and then they would be
 turned

' turned out by all. Yet there was never an *Act* or *mo-*
 ' *tion* of *Abolishing* Episcopacy; but on the contrary,
 ' they continued in their *Dioceses* and *Churches* always
 ' thereafter, and in the very year 1594. *Cunnigham* Bi-
 ' shop of *Aberdeen* did *Baptize* Prince *Henry* at *Ster-*
 ' *ling*; but the King was forced to connive a while at
 ' at their *Insolence*, for they had preached the People in-
 ' to a *persuasion* that the King was to *betray* his own
 ' Crown and Kingdoms to the *King* of *Spain*. And
 ' when three Noblemen were brought to *Tryal* before
 ' the Justice, the Ministers would needs order the *Process*
 ' in *October* 1593, and to *back* them, they stirred up mul-
 ' titudes of the *Rabble* to Arms, thereby to *force* Justice
 ' to decide in *their* favour; nor would they *disband* or
 ' *abstain* from coming before the Judges in armed *Crowds*,
 ' although the King and Council did by *Proclamation* pro-
 ' hibit them. If this be *Presbyterian* Government, it
 ' must be confessed that *Anno* 1590, 1591, 1592, and 1593.
 ' *Presbyters* had it *solely*. But all this time Bishops did
 ' exist by Law, enjoyed their Rents, and preached in their
 ' Churches, if you trust not us, Notice the most *Au-*
 ' *thentic* Records of the Kingdom.

' By Act of Parliament 1. *Jac.* 6. Chap. 7. Ministers
 ' are ordered to be presented by the Patrons to the *Super-*
 ' *intendent* of the *Diocese*. Note, At this time most
 ' of the Bishops were *Popish*, which occasioned the Pro-
 ' testants to appoint *Superintendents*.

' *Anno* 1572. Parl. 3. *Jac.* 6. Chap. 45. The Govern-
 ' ment of the Church is declared to be in the *Archbishops*,
 ' *Bishops*, and *Superintendents*. Note, Both *Bishops*, and
 ' *Superintendents*, are contemporary then in the Church.

' The like owned Chap. 46. 48. and 54. of that Par-
 ' liament.

‘ In the year 1573. The Authority of the Bishops is
 ‘ owned by the first Act of the 4. Par. *Jac. 6.*

‘ In the year 1578. the like by Act. 63. Parl. 5.
 ‘ *Jac. 6.*

‘ In the year 1579. the like by Act. 71. Parliam. 6.
 ‘ *Jac. 6.*

‘ In the year 1581. That the *Bishops* did *continue* in
 ‘ the Church appears from Act 100. Parl. 7. *Jac. 6.*

‘ The like appears from the Acts 106, and 114, of
 ‘ that Parliament.

‘ In the year 1584. The *Bishops Authority* fully own-
 ‘ ed Act. 132. Parl. 8. *Jac. 6.*

‘ In the year 1587. It appears that *Prelacy* existed
 ‘ then by Act 28. Parl. 11. *Jac. 6.*

‘ Also in that 11. Parl. It appears by the Act of *An-*
 ‘ *nexation*, that *Prelacy* did still *exist* by Law, even al-
 ‘ though their *Temporalties* were annexed to the Crown.
 ‘ and by the 111. Act, of that 11. Parl.

‘ In the year 1591, 1592, 1593, and 1594. The *King,*
 ‘ and *Bishops*, could not stop the *Insolence* of *Presby-*
 ‘ *ters*, nor their *meeting* in *Synods* and *Assemblies*, with-
 ‘ out any *interposition* of the Royal Authority, but this
 ‘ hindered not but that the *Bishops* did still *exist* by
 ‘ Law, and *exerced* some part of their Office, and in all
 ‘ *Parliaments* and *Conventions* of *Estates*, the *Prelates* did
 ‘ did always Sit and Vote as the *first* of the *three Estates*,
 ‘ as the Records and *Sederunts* of all the *Parliaments* will
 ‘ prove.

‘ In the year 1596. *Leslie*, Bishop of *Ross*, dying at
 ‘ *Brussels*, Mr. *David Lindsey* was presented by the King
 ‘ to the *Bishoprick* the very next year.

‘ In the year 1598. there was a *Conference* appoint-
 ‘ ed at *Falkland* betwixt the *Commissioners* of the *As-*
 ‘ *sembly*, and some appointed by the King to meet with
 ‘ them.

' them, where they agreed on ten *Articles or Propositi-*
 ' *ons* of Policy, for the Church, relating chiefly to the
 ' *Clergy's Votes* in Parliament, and the *Elections* of Bi-
 ' *shops* in the *Dioceses*; some of these Propositions were
 ' *foolish*, but it was thought convenient that the King
 ' should comply with those *Hot Heads* in *some* things;
 ' for at that time *Severals* began to *debate* his Right of
 ' *Succession* to the *Crown of England*, and so he would
 ' have *all quiet* at Home, yet still this is *evident* that
 ' *Bishops* did then *exist* by Law, and that altho some-
 ' thing concerning them was debated, yet their *Office* and
 ' *Order* was not.

' In the year 1600, these forementioned Articles were
 ' approved in the Assembly at *Monrofs*, *March 28*, 1600.
 ' and to that Assembly Mr. *Dury* (who was the chief Tool
 ' with Mr. *Melvil* for *parity*) at his death did write an
 ' Exhortation disowning his *former Errors*, and earnest-
 ' ly advising them to *submit* to the *ancient Order*, and to
 ' chuse *good Bishops* of the *best* of the *Ministers*.

' In the year 1601. the King called an Assembly of
 ' the Church to meet at *Brunt Island*, where many good
 ' things were Enacted, both for the true Liberty of the
 ' Church, and for *reclaiming* the *Popish Nobility* from
 ' their *Errors*, which proved more *effectual* and *pacifick*
 ' than all the former furious Methods, which at that
 ' time were promoted by a *Hot Headed Man*, called *Da-*
 ' *vidson*, who by a Letter to the Assembly incited them
 ' to declare against the Kings *Hypocrisie*, and other Er-
 ' rors. The Assembly would have proceeded to Censure
 ' him, but the King would not allow it, saying, it was
 ' matter of Joy that these *Hot Heads* were reduced to
 ' one, or some few.

' In the year 1602. the King in an Assembly at *Haly-*
 ' *rood House*, did shew great *Clemency* to some fiery Mini-
 ' sters,

sters, whom the Assembly would have Censured : as also he gave great Satisfaction to the whole Assembly and Nation ; by his excellent Proposals for *establishing* Provisions both for *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. And in this Assembly of the Church was the fifth of *August* appointed an *Anniversary* Thanksgiving for the Kings Delivery from *Gowry's* Conspiracy.

Before the Diet appointed for the next General Assembly, the Crown of *England* did fall to the King by the Death of *Queen Elizabeth* ; so there was no meeting of Church General Assemblies for a while, but the few remaining *Hot Headed* Presbyters were very busie on the Kings removal so far : and fearing the *excellent* Order of the *English* Church (the great Safety and Peace of *Britain* depending on an intire and full Concord of the Island) they were apprehensive that upon such Considerations, the King would heartily promote a further Establishment of *Episcopal* Jurisdiction in *Scotland*. The Presbyterians in this Juncture did busily stir up Prejudices in the People against the Church of *England* ; tho undoubtedly the best *Reformed* Church and *greatest* Bulwark against *Popery*. And though the King, for good Reasons, when he went to *England*, Adjourned the General Assembly from *July* 1604, to *July* 1605. yet these Men prevailed with Nine of the Fifty Presbyteries of *Scotland* to keep the Meeting notwithstanding of the *Kings* Prorogation : where Thirteen Persons meeting did most *Seditiously* run into such *Declarations* against the *Statutes*, and *standing* *Laws*, as were by the *Judicatures* declared *Treason*, and for which Severals of the Thirteen were *Condemned* before the *Justices*. For they could not be persuaded either to *acknowledge*, or *revoke* their *seditious* Pasquils, but they were afterwards pardoned by the *King*, when they confessed that

the

‘the Chancellour encouraged their Meeting in July 1604. and proved it, which forced the Chancellour to prove likewise that they promised to *connive* at his being a *Papist*, and his Possession of what he had of the Church Lands, upon Condition he should *own* them against *Episcopacy*, whereupon the King said that the Presbyterians would betray the *Protestant* Religion in hatred to *Episcopacy*, and the Chancellour would *betray* Episcopacy for *greed* of their *Temporalities*. So far my Author.

And now from all this I infer, that the first Reformers of our Religion in *Scotland* declaimed against the *Tyranny*, and *incroachments* of the Bishop of *Rome*, but never against the *Episcopal* Jurisdiction as such. That Mr. *Wisehart*, and some others of our most Eminent Reformers and *Martyrs* knew no other Government of the Church but *Episcopacy*. The first being bred in the University of *Cambridge*, and others, who were his Disciples, followed his Sentiments. And that the first Reformers submitted to the *Episcopal* Jurisdiction of such of the Bishops as Preached and promoted the *Protestant* Doctrine.

Secondly, That though the *Episcopal* Authority was frequently *weakened*, *crushed* and *interrupted*, by the Popular Insurrections, and Conspiracies of Mr. *Melvil's* Faction, yet it was never legally *abolished*, but rather *continued* in the Church, *secured*, and *defended* by many *Laws*.

Thirdly, That the Presbyterians always watched the *difficult* Postures of the King's Affairs, and whenever they found him at a *disadvantage*, then they made him much more uneasy by Popular Tumults, and Insurrections.

Fourthly, That the *Romish* Clergy never pleaded their *Exemptions* from the Secular Powers more *violently* and *factionously*, than the *Melvilian* Tribe in *Scotland*.

Fifthly, That Episcopacy was not *Abolished* in that *very* year wherein they pretend that Presbytery was Established, but that *Episcopacy* in *Anno 1592.* was still retained in all its *legal Rights, Privileges, and Authority.* It is true that the Insolence of Presbyters was not then to be *resisted,* but by granting them great Liberties, and that this Liberty was granted by the necessitous Circumstances that the King was in.

Sixthly, That the most violent of their Faction had not then the *Impudence* to quarrel the Superiority of a Bishop above a Presbyter, as a thing *unlawful* in it self; but that Mr. *Melvil* made his *approaches* to the ruin of Episcopacy by plausible pretences, *viz.* That it was abused, and that it was not exercised according to its *primitive* designs and *simplicity.*

Seventhly, I observe that Episcopacy was never legally Abolished in *Scotland,* until the Tragical Rebellion in King *Charles* the First his Reign broke forth, and we need not inform the World how unwilling King *Charles* the Martyr was to *Abolish* Episcopacy.

Eighthly, That the Royal Authority never gave way to their Rebellion, and Insolence, when they could hinder it; but sometimes they were forced to yield to grant them great Liberties to avoid the heavier Blows and Thunder Claps of their Fury.

Ninthly, That we can have no better Evidence for any Matter of Fact than the Publick Records of Parliament.

Tenthly, We may clearly discern that the *Vindicators* Book in defence of his Party, is one *Hypocritical Shuffle* from top to bottom. For if Mr. *Melvil,* the Founder of Presbytery, and his Confederates, did *affront* the Kings Person, and declined his *Authority,* and *provoked* the *Rabble,* and *Excommunicated* the *Archbishop,* and was so *rude* to the *Ambassadors* of Foreign Princes, and
profanely

profanely appointed a Fast, with no other design than to baffle the King to his Teeth. Then let me ask the Vindicator why all this Apology, to persuade the World that Presbyterians are not capable of such Villanies as is the Rabbling of the Clergy. Nay, I must tell him Presbyterians did nothing upon this last Revolution, but what they Practised when they had not such opportunities to vent their Malice. And by this unquestionable History he and all others may see, to how little purpose his Distinction of sober Presbyterians, and Cameronians will serve him; for the Cameronians have no Principles different from Presbyterians, nor the Presbyterians from Cameronians, nor is it possible to refute the Cameronians by Presbyterian Principles.

Eleventhly, We may gather from the preceding History, and the constant Practice of Presbyterians, that they have no Principles of Unity amongst themselves, for, the lesser number (if more Popular than their Brethren) may remonstrate with that Insolence, and Fury, against the plurality as to stop the whole course of Discipline, as in the forementioned case of Mr. Andrew Melvil.

Twelfthly, The Spirit of Presbytery, is a Spirit of Tyranny, and cannot endure to Obey, and therefore such as are fully Poisoned with its Principles, (whenever the Decisions of the Publick contradict their own peculiar Plan and Scheme) they immediately fly in the Face of that Authority, they formerly pretended to support, and by general words, which at the bottom have no particular signification, but what they please to put upon them, they pick quarrels, and exceptions against all their own Judicatures, Governments Civil and Ecclesiastical.

This is visible as from many instances, so from the famous Protestations of several biggotted Incendiaries against the General Assembly of the Presbyterians Anno

1651. because that General Assembly did promote the *Publick Resolutions* in order to the Restoring the King to the Exercise of his Government, they pretend that the *General Assembly* was not rightly constituted, that the generality of the *Godly* did adhere to the *Protestors*, that the *Publick Resolutioners* had made *defection*, because they were for bringing again into Places of *Power* and *Trust*, such as would probably serve the King against the Rebellion then on Foot, upon such *pretences* they decline their *Supreme National Judicatory*, and because that *Print* is known but to very few of the present Generation, and since it is a Monument of their Villany and Stubbornness, it may be seen at the end of this Letter. I have no more to add, but that I wish my Skill to serve you, were equal to my Zeal and Affection, for I am in all sincerity

Your most obedient Servant.

The

*The Protestation of divers Ministers,
against the Proceedings of the late
Commission of the Church of Scotland,
as also against the lawfulness of the
present pretended Assembly.*

Right Reverend,

HOW gracious God hath been to the Church of *Scotland*, in giving her pure Ordinances; we trust that while we live, it shall be acknowledged, with thankfulness, by us unto the Most High, of whom we desire Mercy and Grace to adhere unto the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government Established in this Land, amongst the many sad Tokens of the Lords Indignation and Wrath against this Kirk, the present Difference of his Servants in the Ministry, is looked upon by us, and we believe by all the godly in the Land, as one of the greatest. And as we hold it a Duty deeply to be humbled before the Lord in the Sense thereof, and by all lawful and fair means, within the compass of our power and station, to endeavour the remedy; so we do acknowledge a free General Assembly, lawfully Called, and rightly Constituted, and proceeding with Meekness and Love in the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Rule of the Word, and the Acts and Constitutions of this Kirk, to be amongst the first and most effectual means appointed of

M

God

God for obtaining the same, and for preserving Purity, and advancing the power of the Work of Reformation in this Age, and transmitting the same unspotted to our Posterity, and to the Ages and Generations that are to come: but that as the faithful Servants of Jesus Christ in his Church in former times did by his good Hand on them in the right Administration of free and lawful General Assemblies, bring the Work of Reformation in *Scotland* unto a great Perfection, and high Conformity with the first Pattern: so unfaithful Men minding their own things more than things of Christ, and Usurping over their Brethren, and the Lords Inheritance, did deface the beauty thereof, first by encroaching upon the Liberty and Freedom of Assemblies, afterwards by taking away the very Assemblies themselves. Therefore remembering and calling to mind the many Bonds and Obligations that lie upon us from the Lord, and being desirous to be found faithful in this day of Temptation, and to exonerate our Consciences as in his sight, and to avoid the accession unto that guiltiness in which many have involved themselves. And conceiving that this Meeting is not a lawful General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, in regard that the Election of Commissioners to the same, have been limited and prejudiced in the due Liberty thereof, by a Letter and Act of their Commissioners of the last Assembly sent to Presbyteries, appointing such Brethren as after Conference remained unsatisfied with, and continued to oppose the Publick Resolutions, to be Cited to the General Assembly. And in regard the Commission of many Burghs and Presbyteries are absent, as wanting free access, by reason of the Motions of the Enemy: and in regard that many of the Commissioners of the last General Assembly have carried on a course of defection, contrary to the Trust committed to them, and to the Acts and Constitu-

tions of this Church : and who in their Remonstrances and Papers, have stirred up the Civil Magistrate against such who are unsatisfied in their Consciences with their Proceedings, and who have prelimited the Assembly, by their Letter and Act formerly mentioned, are admitted to Sit, and Voted as Members of the Assembly, and their Moderator chosen to be Moderator of the Assembly, notwithstanding timous exception was made against them, that they ought not to be admitted as Members of the Assembly, until their Proceedings were first tried and approven by the Assembly : and in regard that his Majesty, and his Majesties Commissioners by his Speech, did incite too hard Courses against these who are unsatisfied in their Consciences, with the Proceedings of the Commissioners, before the trial and approbation of the Commission Book, or any Act made by the Assembly for the approving their Proceedings ; we do upon these, and many others important grounds and reasons, to be proponed and given in time and place convenient, in the name of the Church of *Scotland*, and in our names, and in the name of all Ministers, Ruling-Elders, and Professours of this Kirk, who do, or shall adhere to us, Protest against the Validity and Constitution of this Assembly, as not being free and lawful : and that they may not assume unto themselves any Authority, nor exercise any Power or Jurisdiction for determining of Controversies, making of Acts emitting of Declarations, judging of Protestations or Appeals, or Proceedings of Synods, or inferior Judicatories, or Censuring Persons or Papers, or issuing of Commissions of whatsoever sort to any persons whatsoever, and in particular Protests that they may not proceed unto the Approbation or Ratification of the Proceedings of the former Commission, not only because of the want of just Power and Authority so to do, but also because these Proceedings contain many

things contrary to the Trust committed to their Commissioners, especially their allowing and carrying on a Conjunction with the Malignant Party, and bringing them into Places of Power and Trust in the Judicatories and in the Army, contrary to the Word of God, Solemn League and Covenant, the Solemn Confession of Sins, and Engagement to Duties, the constant Tenor of Warnings, Declarations, Remonstrances, Causes of Humiliations, Letters, Supplications, Acts and Constitutions of this Kirk, and the laying a Foundation for the Civil Magistrate, to meddle with these things which concern Ministers, their Doctrine and Exercise of Ministerial Duties before they be Cited, Tried, and Censured by the Judicatories of the Kirk. And we Protest that whatsoever Determinations, Acts, Ratifications, Declarations, Censures, or Commissions that shall be made or given by them, may be Void and Null, and may not be interpreted as binding to the Kirk of *Scotland*; but that notwithstanding thereof, it may be free for us, and such as adhere to us, to Exercise our Ministry and enjoy the due Christian Liberty of our Consciences, according to the Word of God, National Covenant, Solemn League and Covenant, the Confession of Sins, and Engagements to Duties, and all the Acts and Constitutions of this Kirk, and that there may be liberty to chuse Commissioners, and to Convene a Free and Lawful General Assembly, when there shall be need, and the Lord shall give opportunity, and to add what further reasons shall have weight for strengthening this our Protestation, and shewing the nullity of this Assembly, and the unwarrantableness of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of the former Assembly; and that these presents may be put upon Record in the Registers of the General Assembly to be extant *ad futuram rei memoriam*.

am, and that we may have a subscribed Extract under the Clerks hand.

Subscribed and presented at St. Andrews 20. July, 1651. by Mr. A. C. Moderator of the last Assembly.

Mr. Samuel Rutherford.	Mr. William Guthery.
Mr. James Guthery.	Mr. Alexander Moncreif.
Mr. Patrick Gillespy.	Mr. John Hamilton in In-
Mr. John Meinzie.	derkip.
Mr. Ephraim Melvin.	Mr. Robert Muire.
Mr. John Carstairs.	Mr. John Hart.
Mr. William Adair.	Mr. Andrew Donaldson.
Mr. Thomas Wyllie.	Mr. Robert Keith.
Mr. John Nevoy.	And ten other Ministers.
Mr. James Simpson.	

Right Reverend,

WE are constrained by many necessities, and by transferring of the Assembly, to be absent from your subsequent meeting; and having laid to Heart what the Lord requireth of us in this day of so sad a Dispensation, and so sore a Controversie against the Land. We think our selves bound in Conscience, to lay open to you, that we are much unsatisfied with the Proceedings of the Commissioners of the late General Assembly relating to the in-bringing and in-trusting of the Malignant Party, with the Consequences thereof; there issuing forth one Act with a Letter, to the prejudice, as we conceive, of the Presbyteries Election of Commissioners to this Assembly, which hath need to be looked on, least the Freedom of this High Court of Jesus Christ, by such preparatives, be infringed. We wish it be your Wisdoms care, that begun Evils be remedied, our bleed-

ing

ing Wounds with tender Hands bound up, and that the fierce Wrath of the Lord smoaking in our Bowels may be quenched: and do in all humility and reverence of your Wifdoms, and tendernefs of respect to precious Men, whom we much honour and love in the Lord, though in this matter we most differ from them in Judgments; Protest that the foresaid Proceedings be not Ratified and approved by you, and that we be not involved in the Guilt and Consequences to the Ratifications thereof: and this we crave to be Recorded in your Register for the Vindication of Truth, and exoneration of our Consciences. The Lord give you wisdom in all things, and powre out upon you a spirit of Healing the backslidings of the Land, of building up our Breaches.

We rest

Your Wifdoms loving Brethren

and Servants in Christ.

Subscribed and sent from Perth to Dundee (to which place the Assembly was Adjourned from S. Andrews upon the 21. July 1651.) by M. Alexander Dunlap, William Sumervell, John Mauld, James Donaldson, John Veatch, John Hammilton in Carmichael, Alexander Barterem, Ministers; and William Brown of Dolphington, a Ruling Elder.

POST-

P O S T S C R I P T.

WHEN the Printer had cast off the former Sheets, there appeared here a scurrilous Pamphlet, intituled an Answer to the *Scots Presbyterian Eloquence* in three parts. If you would have a Character of the Author you must read the Book, and perhaps by so doing, you may meet with something that is extraordinary, and which cannot so easily fall under words; he appears with all the storm and Thunder that passion and rage can furnish him with, he breaths nothing but violence and indignation, and blusters with so much fury, that at first view you may perceive him as great a Separatist from good nature and modesty, as he is from the Christian Church and her Worship.

He divides his Pamphlet into three parts. In the first, he complains of cruel Laws made against the *Presbyterians* in the former Reigns. In the second, he meddles with the Author of the *Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*. In the third, he assaults the Sermons and Lives of the Bishops and Clergy.

As to the first, King *Charles II.* and our subordinate Governors made no Laws against the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, but what they were forc'd to make in their own defence; when the King was restor'd to his *hereditary right*, and the Nations deliver'd from their *Egyptian bondage*; the Parliament being call'd they enacted such Laws as were absolutely necessary for preserving their Liberty and fundamental

damental Constitution: and because they had so sadly smarted under their cruel Taskmasters (the Covenanters) in the late Civil Wars, they took care in the first place, by gentle Laws both to reclaim the deluded, and secure their own safety. The frequent attempts and insurrections of the *Presbyterians* afterwards oblig'd them to make more severe Laws, nor did ever any man in that Period suffer capital punishment, but for high Treason against the King and State. If their errors and delusions were purely speculative, and did not upon all turns prompt them to overturn the Government and grasp the Sovereignty, they might live in *Scotland* in all peace and tranquility, as other Dissenters did. But

* Vid. *Hind let loose. Nephthali Jus populi.*

when the whole * Scheme of their Religion (as far as they differ from the Episcopal party) is nothing in it self but ungovernable humor and Rebellion, and when their insolence became so intolerable that they proclaim'd open War against the King in his own Dominions, and preach'd to their Hearers that they ought to kill his Servants, and that he had no right to the Crown because he broke the Covenant; what Apology needs there be made against the unreasonable clamours of such desperate Incendiaries, especially when their cruelties towards the *Episcopal Church* both *Clergy* and *Laity* after the Year 1637. were unparallel'd in History, as they were diabolical in their nature. And their Oath of the Covenant impos'd upon all ranks and degrees of persons within the Nation, and (Children at the Schools not excepted) with greater tyranny, malice and violence than the Fathers of the Inquisition ever practis'd.

What was it then that the King was to be blam'd for, and his Ministers of State? Why; they would not acknowledg that the King had lost his right to the Crown, they defended his calm and obedient Subjects
from

from the hands of these religious Harpyes who would needs persuade the Nation, that there was no Sin so much to be dreaded, as any the least transgression of the solemn League and Covenant. The King and his Ministers of State might more plausibly be accus'd of cruelty, if they had made severe Laws against the *consequences of Presbyterian Opinions*, rather than against *the open and avowed efforts* of treachery and Rebellion; Prudence and caution might arm them against the first, but self-defence, the Laws of nature and Nations, their own honour and safety, must needs prompt them to the second.

In short, you will meet with nothing in the first part of this Pamphlet, but an ill-contriv'd abstract of the *Hind let loose*, and you know that the Episcopalians took care to compendise that Book, and publish it of new, that all men might see the principles, practices and humors of that Sect whom they oppose: nor can there be a better defence of *King Charles the seconds Government*, than the *Hind let loose*, if duly consider'd, and upon the whole matter I will only say this, that if the Ministers of State under *King Charles II. in Scotland* have done nothing against the *Presbyterians*, but what all wise, great, and good Men have done in the like cases, then the Clamours of this party against their Ministry are rather an honour to, than an accusation against their proceedings. For as long as there are any Records of publick transactions preserv'd in our Nation, the Rebellions under *King Charles I. and II.* and the principles by which they have been maintain'd, and the * Artifices, made use of to delude the people unto misery and Enthusiasm, can never be forgotten: and if there was no other Book extant but the Acts of their General Assemblies, they sufficiently vindicate *King Charles II.* and his Ministers of State from any shadow of cruelty and rigor.

* Vid. *King's large Manifesto.*

But all this and much more is made evident by the *Learned and Loyal* * *Advocate* in his short and accurate Defence of *King Charles the 2ds. Government*, where he attacks, and baffles by Reason, Law, and the customs of Nations, the little cavils and exceptions started against the administrations of that *wise and peaceable Monarch*. A Book which shall never be answered, I do not mean, that they shall not write against it, but that it is unanswerable, and they may as wisely run a tilt against a Rock, as endeavour to shake any part of its main design. The reasonings of it are so clear, the historical retorsions so undeniable, and the villanies of their factions and combinations so transparent, that to meddle with that Book will more and more discover their folly, as well as renew their correction: and the publisher of it thinks still he has done the Nation good service; and he is the

* *Answer to the Scottish Presbyterian Eloquence*, p. 27.

more confirmed in his Opinion, that he perceives, that the little and hidden Nurslings of Presbytery are galled by it *. It is a Lye that *Sir George Mackenzie* pretended he would not publish it, tho he would not allow a Copy *surreptitiously* procured to come abroad without his immediate orders and directions; and when he saw it convenient, he recommended it to his Friend to publish it; and it might have been printed a good while before he died, if the *publisher* had not been diverted by many little Occurrences. But let not this Scribler, or any of his party, blame *Sir George Mackenzie*, that their Covenants were added to the Treatise lately mentioned; this is solely to be imputed to the *Publisher*, and he needs no Apology for the doing of it, since they are *undeniable monuments of their incurable stubbornness* and Rebellion: and the reasonings in the Treatise it self are frequently related to, and illustrated by

by those wicked Papers, I mean the *Bonds and Covenants* of that restless Faction. But to end this Paragraph, you may tell this Accuser, that the original Copy written by *Mr. Andrew Johnstone* (then *Amanuensis* to *Sir George Mackenzie*) is still in the *Publishers* hands.

The Scribler unwarily does us a great deal of honour, when he tells the World that the practices of *Presbyterians* under the Reign of *King Charles II.* were prosecuted and opposed by such as the *Duke of Queensberry*, *Marquis of Athol*, *Earl of Linlithgow*, *Viscount of Tarbat*, *Lieutenant General Drummond*, and *Sir George Mackenzie*. If he understood the Laws of Consequence, he might easily see that Men of their Quality, Sense and Interest are too great a weight in the opposite Scale, and since we have just reason to glory in their parts, honour and integrity, it is very odd that he should be so foolish, as to own that we are favour'd by persons of their merit and vertue. 'Tis pleasant to see with what rudeness and vanity this little Man assaults the memory of *Sir George Mackenzie*; so have I seen sometimes when a generous *Falcon* drops dead to the ground, the *Kites*, the *Crows*, and the *Jackdaws* gather about him, and solemnize a *Jubilee*, and yet even when he lies dead they dare not touch one of his feathers. He may remember the Fable, that when the *Lion* was expiring, the *Ass* amongst other Beasts kick'd him, and insulted over him. I do not mean by this, that *Sir George Mackenzie*, if he were alive, would have taken notice of his bawling or buffoonry; but to let him see, that he is as void of generosity and honour, as he is of common sense and modesty.

Quis genus Aeneadam? ---
Virg.

Phadri Fabula.

In this first Part he appears very uneasy, that the Episcopal Party are not Persecuted to the utmost, and upbraids us ever and anon with the Lenity that we meet with under the present Government, and again must needs persuade the World, that

pag. 26.

our Principles of *Passive Obedience* are more dangerous to the present Government, than the Principles of the *Covenant* were to the former. But if there be no more in the case than *Passive Obedience*, I think the Government needs not be afraid; and if the Episcopal Party are not so violently Persecuted now, if they do not feel those loads of Misery that they groaned under from the year 1638. to 1649, (when the *Covenanted Zealots* were uppermost) this is not at all to be imputed to the Lenity of Presbyterians, but to the restraints that are laid upon them by the opposite Biass of the *Nobility* and *Gentry*, and because their most terrible Weapon of *Excommunication* is blunted (the Civil Penalties that formerly did attend it being taken away) this is the true Reason why they do not Prosecute their Antagonists with *Excommunications*, because such Censures now have no force; so that notwithstanding of all his *Panegyricks* in commendation of their Meekness, we look upon them still as *Tygers Chained*, not altered in their Nature, but much more galled and irritated by their restraint. If the *Scotch* Episcopal Party has any favour in *England* or in *Scotland*, they ought to thank God for it, and his *Instruments* whom he directs, and employs to preserve them. I hope 'tis visible to the World, with what Industry and Application, and by what Engines and Means, Presbyterians are resolved to destroy them.

In the Second Part of his Pamphlet he falls foul upon the Author of the *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, in which Scuffle I am not at all concerned. I think the Author

thor of that Collection was to blame, that he did not more particularly relate the times when, the persons, by whom, and places where, such Stuff was Preached, and perhaps he has been unwary as to some Stories which need Confirmation, but since there is such variety and multitude of true Stories of that Nature, nothing should be advanc'd to their disadvantage that is not duly attested. As for the Inconsistencies charged upon the Author of the *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, they are not worth your while to consider them, nor have I any inclination to examine them, nor am I concerned to offer my mediation between them; only let me inform you that the Book of which I send you the *General History*, contains not one good Consequence from the beginning to the end.

I have heard that the *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence* has been much talked off, and therefore I take the liberty to acquaint you with the Reasons that induce me to believe, that there was no injury done the *Scotch Presbyterians* in the publishing of that Book.

First, Because the Printed Accounts cited from their Books are equal to the unprinted relations of their *Sermons and Prayers*. Mr. *Rutherford's Letters* alone have in them many coarse and abusive Metaphors, and Applications that are mean and loathsome; and though I do not at all in this Letter meddle with his design and meaning, yet I think it but a modest Censure to say, that there was in those Letters more Popularity than Piety. I know the Party do magnifie him highly, and it is no part of my business to lessen their Opinion of him; yet I must tell you, that in the esteem of all impartial Men he must fall below the Character they bestow upon him. He had Read Dr. *Twisse*, and others of his Opinion, and if any Learning appear in his Books, it is but
some

some of the *Metaphysicks* he had borrowed from Dr. Twisse, as Dr. Owen, in his Treatise *De Justitiâ Vindicativâ*, assures us. And he was so plunged in these *Metaphysical Whimsies*, that none can make Sense of what he wrote. Let his Patrons consider that Chapter in his *Exercitationes Apologeticæ pro Divinâ Gratiâ*, wherein he pretends to answer that Argument, *Quod unusquisque tenetur credere*, and then tell me if they can boast of his Perspicuity and Solidity. Of the same Stamp are his *Metaphysical Dissertations* annexed to his Book *De Providentiâ, de Ente Possibili*: if I had the Book by me, I think I could give you Divertisement. I know very well what our Adversaries will say, *viz.* that I do not understand him, and I must sincerely acknowledge they are in the right of it.

But Secondly, The most blasphemous Stories in the Book called the *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, can be proved by the best and most undeniable Evidence, *viz.* That of Mr. *Urquhart's* concerning the *Lords Prayer*, that of Mr. *Kirkton's* concerning the *Holy Ghost*, and that he believed *Abraham run out of the Land of Caldea for debt*. Now I agree with this *angry Scribler*, so far, that these are horrid and blasphemous expressions, and I pitch upon them, because he himself thinks that nothing can be worse, and that these Expressions alone (if falsely alledged) disprove the whole Collection. Now we fairly offer to prove these three, the first against Mr. *Urquhart*, the other two against Mr. *Kirkton*. This is undeniably just by his own Concessions *Pag.* 61. and if such blasphemous Stories are openly tolerated, what must we expect from that Society of Men, and I have in the former *Treatise* given you two instances of greater Ignorance and Nonsense in the Printed Books of Mr. *Rule*, than any that's to be found in the *Scotch Eloquence*. As for the Stories cited from the *Scotch Eloquence* against
Mr. *Rule*,

Mr. *Rule*, and mentioned by him in *Pag.* 61. I do not truly believe them, unless I have better Authority for them.

Thirdly, suppose that one had a mind to make Stories to the disadvantage of the *Scotch Presbyterians*, yet their *jargon* is so coarsly extravagant, that it is not possible for any Man to speak their Language, unless he had been Educated in their *Gibberish*, and the Harmony between their Printed Books, and their unprinted Sermons is so exact, that none can doubt of the last who Read the first. Let me but name one Man, it is Mr. *J. K.* his Fancy is so *Comical*, so surprizing, so unimitable, that it is not possible to say any thing as he says it himself, nor yet to ascribe to another what is said by him; and this way of Preaching is no new thing amongst the Presbyterians. They always accused the Episcopalians that their Sermons were Cold, and Dry, and Moral Discourses, and were not Calculated to the Capacities and Affections of the People as *theirs* were, and therefore they complied so much with the *Genius* of the People that they forgot the Majesty of Religion, and the distinction between things Sacred and Prophane.

Fourthly, There may be so many Stories added of their abusive Distorsions of the Scripture with Authentick attestations, that it were their wisdom to let this Debate fall. For Preaching after their way is become of late so trifling an Exercise, that no Man could perform it to the satisfaction of their thorow-pac'd Disciples, but he that was either an extraordinary Hypocrite, or well advanced in Madness, and whatever Men pretend that have considered the affair but superficially, 'tis necessary to expose that absurd, sensual, and ludicrous Sect, that Metamorphose Religion, and its Solemn Exercises unto Theatrical Scenes. If the great things of Religion
be

be true, if we have any thing that distinguishes us from the Beasts that perish, if our Souls survive our Bodies, and if our belief and hopes of invisible things, and the state of Retribution be not intirely a Dream : what greater affront can be done to the *Majesty of God*, the dignity of Human Nature, and the Common Sense of Mankind, than thus by mock Sermons to Lampoon the great Truths of the Gospel? Did not our *meek and blessed Saviour* chastise the Hypocrisie of the *Pharisees* with greater severity, than the more open and undisguised lewdness of *Publicans and Sinners*? And *St. Paul* treats them with no other Language, than that of *dogs, evil workers, and the concision*; their Character is more at length in the *Epistle of St. Jude*; such religious Scorers do in the most effectual manner promote *Atheism*, and they that Act Devotion after the manner of a Farce, do expose it more than the Wits, and the *Philosophers*.

Upon this consideration alone the *Presbyterian Preachments* do more harm to Piety, than the most subtle Arguments of Ancient and Modern *Atheists*: we are supported against *Atheism* by the strength of Natural Reason, when we are attacked gravely by plausible appearances: but when we are surprized and disarmed by the sudden insinuations of Raillery, we are quickly overcome, not because we are weak, but because we do not resolutely encounter the Enemy. One Sermon mixt with such fooleries, as give occasion to this Digression, do more real hurt than can be imagined; and if it be a fault to Publish them, how intolerable is it to Preach them, and to support Societies that seem to design nothing less than to ridicule all Religion. But it is the just Judgment of God, that they who have forsaken the Unity of the Church should be *given up to strong delusions*.

In the third part of his *Pamphlet*, he heaps together some monstrous and ridiculous Stories against the Clergy, and though one had sufficient strength to grapple with a *Scavenger* and lay him in the Mire, yet methinks the undertaking is neither generous nor decent. There are a great many of them that he asperges that I know nothing off, so it is not reasonable to expect that I should meddle in their affairs, and yet if they were the most arrant Villains upon Earth, I am able to demonstrate, that his Testimony against them is not Valid. And therefore I humbly beg of all disinterested Strangers to consider but a few Particulars; and then let them judge whether the accusations of Presbyterians against the Episcopal Church of *Scotland* are to be valued.

First, They may remember that this way of Libelling, is the true *Characteristick* of the Party, and we need gather no other instances to prove this, than the Practises of their *General Assembly*, Anno 1638. Who (when they Sat) Libelled the *Venerable Archbishop Spotswood*, and all his Brethren of that Order, of the most abominable Crimes, and charged them with the sins of *Habitual Lying, Swearing, Drunkenness, Adultery, Incest, Sodomy, and Sorcery*, with an *&c.* and they past their Censures upon them as guilty of these Abominations, and inserted the names of particular *Gentlemen* as Witnesses, who were never acquainted with this Contrivance: and ordered all the *Ministers of the Nation* to Read all these Libels and Sentences from their Pulpits, as if the whole Process had been fairly examined, and the Witnesses had appeared before that *Packt Jury* of Mock Ecclesiasticks.

Now this was the Solemn Act of the whole Party met in a *General Assembly*, who concerted those Methods, when they were mutually conscious to the Knavery of one another, and defying the *Omniscience of Heaven*, went on resolutely against their own Convictions, as well as the Practice of all former Ages. It is but ordinary for private Men to assault the Reputation of others, but what degrees of wickedness must they arrive to, that Combine together, and own to one another, that the plainest Laws of God might be trampled upon, rather than miss their end. And this Villany is still upon Record, and to their everlasting disgrace undeniable, and will continue so, as long as there are any Monuments of that Nation preserv'd.

Their Predecessors thus United, found Calumny the most proper Weapon, and effectual Instrument to serve their Malice, and to disgrace amongst the deluded People, Grave, Learned, Loyal, and Judicious Men; and the People were quickly undeceived, when the Covenanters got into the Saddle: for from the year 1638. to the year 1652. (when *Oliver* grew weary of their insolence) the Nation groaned under the saddest and most unutterable Bondage. The *Reader* is therefore desired to remember that no Man can continue a Presbyterian without the Arts of Calumny. *Omne imperium conservatur iisdem artibus quibus primo acquiritur*: and when the Varnish of Hypocrisy drops off, then the Tyranny supported by it must sink. The Presbyterians began their Faction with Calumny, and they cannot now (if they would) lay it aside. What could the Episcopal Clergy expect from their present Persecutors, less than their Predecessors

met

met with in that *General Assembly*? Who stuck at nothing, how monstrous soever, to promote their end; when they forbear to breath, then it is that they forbear to *Slander* and *Calumniate*.

When upon the late Revolution the Presbyterians were impowred more plainly to discover their Nature, the first thing they betook themselves to was that of *Libelling*; and when they have now wearied themselves (if they can be wearied of what is so natural to the *Faction*) and exposed their own Reputation by invading that of other Mens, they must yet goe on, not that they find this Method successful, but because they cannot forbear; and it is enough for the Reader to know that they cannot name three of the Clergy of *Scotland* justly deprived for Immoralities, after all their Insidious Arts, Libellings, and Clamours since the Revolution.

But to make the Villany of that *General Assembly*, I lately named a little more conspicuous, I desire the Reader may remember a very memorable Story. It is this, The *Assembly* pretended that the Bishops were proved guilty of all the Crimes that were imputed to them, by *sufficient Evidence*; and therefore they inserted the names of several *Gentlemen*, and others, in their Sentences, as Witnesses of the Libels. And in their Sentence against the *Archbishop Spotswood*, the *Laird of Balfour*, in *Fife*, was named as a Witness, whereas this *Honest Gentleman* never knew any thing of the matter; and all the time of the Sitting of that *Mock Assembly*, he had never been from his own House, which is at least *threescore Miles*

Anno 1638.

That you may be fully informed of the tricks, disingenuity, illegal Practises, and tumultuous Villanies of the Covenanters, you are earnestly desired to Read King Charles I. large Declaration in Folio. Lond. Printed for Rob. Young, 1639.

from Glasgow. But Mr. Colin Adam, Minister of Anstruther-Easter, did Read the Sentence against the Archbishop, from the Pulpit upon a Sunday, according to the Assemblies appointment, the Laird of Balfour being in the Church, and hearing his own name Read as a Witness of the Libel against the Archbishop, went out of the Church, and immediately after Sermon called for the Minister, and challenged him how he could Read *His* name in such a Villanous Paper, since he himself knew that he had not been from Home all the time of the Assembly, and so could not have been a Witness there. To which the Minister answered, that he knew well enough he was not a Witness, but the Assembly had inserted his name, and he durst not but Read as they had ordered. Now let the World judge what an Assembly this was, and what Credit ought those Enemies of Mankind and good Nature ever to have, after such a palpable Wickedness; that when they had charged the Fathers of the Church with such Abominations, they should presume to abuse the names of Particular Gentlemen, as Witnesses of their own inventions.

After this piece of undeniable History, I would gladly know, whether any Modest Man thinks it necessary, that a particular answer should be returned to the odious Libel against the unstained Reputation of that Pious, Prudent, Learned, and Loyal Martyr Archbishop Sharp, who cannot be named, but to the disgrace of the Scotch Presbyterians. I need not upon this occasion run out into Tragical Exclamations against their Impudence,
the

the more they Lye, the more true they are to the Spirit of the Party. They cannot be more kind to his Reputation than they were to his Life, *whom they barbarously murdered, and whose Assassines were magnified in their Pamphlets.* And though *this little unknown Accuser* pretends that he was not Murdered by the *Presbyterians*, because (forsooth) one of their Ministers in *Holland* refused the Sacrament to one of the Murderers, yet it was undeniably the effect of their united Combination, and justified in their Pamphlets, and attempted once, and threatned frequently before. We dare him, and all his Associates, to answer what Mr. *Sheilds* has Written relating to this Affair: my meaning is, that this *effort* of their Villany was not the result of private Passion, but the avowed and just Consequence of their Principles, and then let their Patrons tell me if they meet with any thing worse in the Morals of the *Jesuits*, that are every where so justly exposed. They agree in their Notions, but exceed them far by their Bawling, Rudeness, and Buffoonry. The Jesuit is Mannerly and Artificial, but the *Scotch* Presbyterian seems to act by the mechanism of his Nature.

Vide *Hind* *let loose.*

Vide *Hind* *let loose throughout.*

Slanders and Calumny, being thus Authorized by the Assembly, it was no wonder to see their Leading Men Practise the same Villanies; therefore it is that you find Mr. *Rutherford*, Gravely and Maliciously, accuse the *Bishops* of the same Crimes, that the *Assembly* accused them of, in his Preface to *Lex Rex*, which I cannot Cite more particularly, having no Books by me.

Secondly,

Secondly, Such as are Strangers to our affairs, must remember that this Trade of Libelling the Clergy is no Reflection upon our Country. For the whole Body of the Clergy of *England* were thus maliciously assaulted, and all the Crimes Libell'd against them, that their Enemies could invent. And if such an illustrious Body of Ecclesiasticks were thus rudely treated, can the Clergy of *Scotland*, under their present Miseries and Oppressions, expect fairer Quarters.

Thirdly, I desire the Reader to consider with how much Rudeness and Ignorance, this *unknown Lamponer* bespatters the present Clergy of the Church of England, and the Laity of her Communion. It is no part of my business to transcribe his Characters*, if he had assaulted only some private Men, in some remote Corners of our Country, he might be thought only to defend his own Party, but when he foams nothing but Spite and Rancour, and Violence, against all Men of whatever Rank, Nation, or Dignity, I again wish the unbyass'd Reader to tell me if this Man should be particularly answered. It is not possible for him to hide his Nature, the paltry eruptions of his Choler are ungovernable. He seems to forget his own design (which was to make the Scotch Clergy odious in England) he accuses *them* before whom he Pleads, as much as *those* who were the first Objects of his Indignation.

* You may meet with them at length Page 4. of his Pamphlet.

But this is not enough, he attacks not only our prime Nobility and Gentry, but all our Kings since the Reformation. I am afraid I have troubled you too much, and therefore I make haste in a word or two, to examine the Characters he gives of particular men, as far as I know them.

Some he accuses as guilty of gross Immoralities, that were actually for such Immoralities deposed and censured by their *Ecclesiastick Superiors*, such were *Dean Hamilton, Ninian Paterson, John Anderson of Terregles, and Kockburn of St. Bothens*. And is it not very strange that he should accuse the justice of our *Ecclesiastical Superiors*, because of such vitious persons as were actually censured by their Authority. So it seems in this man's Language they are accountable for them whom they censure, as well as for others. Others he names that are not at all of my acquaintance, and it is nothing but what I expected, that the Agents of the party would employ their little Missionaries to gather Stories from all corners of the Country amongst their Disciples.

The first that he endeavours to abuse, is *Dr. Paterson Archbishop of Glasgow*, and that in a stile becoming the true race of the *Gnosticks*, I mean *Scotch Presbyterians*, who have no other precedents in History, than these *impure Sectaries*, whose lives were a *disgrace* to humane Nature, as well as a *reproach* to Religion. The World is not yet so besotted as to think that the *Archbishop of Glasgow* needs particular answers. Indeed, I must acknowledge that the Author has pretty well secured himself against such Apologies: his accusations are so *obscene*,

scene, that no *Christian* must name them; and therefore he has hid himself in a *Cloud of Forgeries*, that none can repeat *but a Devil*, and none could invent *but the Author*. *The Arch-bishops Character, Merit and Parts*, cannot but draw upon him the *Odium* of the whole Party. And I wish with all my heart,

Vid. Pag. 64.

they had not try'd his patience by *more terrible methods*, than those of *Pasquils*

and *Calumnies*.

The next of my Acquaintance is *Mr. Brown Minister of Drysdale*, and the foolish Notes that he makes him to have preach'd, is a pure Forgery, a Lye in which there is not any mixture of truth. His connivances of the *Adultery of Lockerby with Archbald Johnstone of Kirkburn's Wife*, is of the same stamp with the former, for he prosecuted the *Adulterer* so vigorously, that he got him *excommunicated*, and continued so under the *highest Censures of the Church*, untill the evidences of his *repentance* obliged the *Bishop* to absolve him.

Pag. 66.

In the next Paragraph he mentions *Mr. Cant*, whom he names *underling* to

Pag. 71.

Mr. Hamilton, and whom he rails at again. *Mr. Andrew Cant* was never *underling* to any dead nor alive, though still subordinate to his *Governors* both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical*: the unaffected freedom of his temper makes him now and then a scourge to *Hypocrites*, and he still preaches the *Gospel* to all that observe him by his patience, as he did lately by his excellent *Sermons*: and the stories forged of him are but the exhalations of the *Libellers* infectious breath.

In

In the next Paragraph to Mr. *Cant*, he mentions several who had their Mission and Education from the *Presbyterians*, and if they preach'd such things, we know to whom they owe it; many of 'em are dead long since, and it was not possible upon the restitution of the Government *Anno 1660*, so speedily to recover the *Clergy* from *Presbyterian* fooleries, for tho they complied with *Episcopacy*, such as grew old under *Presbytery*, spoke still the Language of *Ashdod*: for being enjoin'd under *Presbytery* to preach perpetually against *Montrose*, and the *Malignants*: they stumbled now and then into their former blunderings; and it is pleasant to see this Man accuse the Church for the sayings of *Presbyterians*, who though they complied with *Episcopacy* upon the restoration of the Government; yet still they wore the marks of their former slavery in their Phrase as well as in their Faces, such are most of them he names, *Pag. 66. 67.*

But the most impetuous Efforts of his malice are level'd against *Dr. Canaries*. The *Doctor* told me, That these were not the first Essays of their Civility towards him; for he being employed by some of the *Episcopal Clergy* to represent their grievances at Court, the *Presbyterians* from that very moment fixed their Eye upon him, and prosecuted him with all the Calumnies that their fury and common practices in such cases could suggest unto them. But still they found the *Doctor* too hard for them, and the wise Men amongst them have frequently own'd to him, that as they hated such Methods, so they highly disapprov'd the particular injustice that was done to the *Doctor*. Mr. *Spalding* who was Clerk to the first pretended *Assembly* after the *Revolution*, and

is now one of the Preachers of *Dundee*, was put upon searching after such a Story; but (as he confesses to *Mr. Carstairs*) he found there was nothing to be made of it. And the *Doctor* appeals, both to *Mr. Carstairs*, and *Mr. Spalding* for the truth of this, and he doubts not but that they will readily do him justice in it, and and it is very odd that this Libeller should accuse him of new, when he stood two Trials before the Privy Council, when it was highly Presbyterian, and proceeded against the *Episcopal Clergy* with the greatest rigor: and another before a *Presbyterian Synod*, in which all the Members except three Ministers, and three ruling Elders, were mighty violent against him. And in both these Trials he so baffled his Accusers, that the *Judicatories* treated him with special Honour, and acquitted him from all the Calumnies that were charged upon him, and reprov'd his Enemies for their malicious libelling of him. And this Narrative the *Doctor* can prove by authentick Extracts, which he has in his own hands. So that the *underling Pedlars* amongst the *Presbyterians* may write what they please, 'tis not now in their power to hurt him. And the *Doctor* further appeals to the Presbytery of *Selkirk*, when he was there, how readily they would have received him into their *Communion*, such a paticular esteem they had for him. The Story that's *metamorphos'd* by this Accuser into a prodigious villany is no more than this, That the *Doctor*, when he was a Boy at the University, fell into the Company of two other *Young Gentlemen* at *Dundee*, and they three walking about the Fields in the Summer-time, met in the Evening with some Women that were watching in the Fields the Linnen that they had wash'd, the other two Gentlemen accosted some of these Women,

men, by amorous and foolish Embraces, and the *Doctor* over hearing one of them squeak, he called them back, and chid them for what they had done, and told them if there was any noise made about it, he would declare he had no accession to it. And when this trifling Story was examined before the Presbytery of *Dundee*, both the Women, and the other two Gentlemen acquitted the *Doctor*, and constantly owned that he had no share in it at all. And this is remarkable, that there was no Circumstance relating to it, but what was examined by *Mr. Rate*, then *Minister of Dundee*, an *Indulg'd Presbyterian*. Nor did the *Doctor* go out of the Nation till two years after that, upon occasion of his Fathers death. By this Story one may see the Malice, and indefatigable Industry of that Sect, it was the *Doctors* early fate to be accused by the Presbyterians; and though no part of the Story be within any possible degrees of Truth: yet the Reader may see, how the Libeller Vapours, as if he had the best and clearest Evidence. And since the *Doctor* has lived eighteen or nineteen years beyond the reach of Calumny, blameless, to the Conviction of his Enemies, how foolish, and how impious is it to accuse him.

As for his being Popish he has given an account of that in the Preface to his Sermon Printed at *London* 1686; but that he was a *Jesuit* is a Lye, for he was never of any Order in *that Church*, and his Zeal against Popery did sufficiently appear, and all that know him, know his Innocence, as to all the malicious Slanders invented against him.

The following Paragraph, pag. 72. mentions *Mr. Monro*, commonly called *Doctor Monro*. I am sufficiently ac-

quainted with the *Doctor*, and he says so little of him, that I may be allowed to examine it particularly. First, He's commonly called *Dr. Monro*, and the meaning of this is one of two, either a *Fanatick Squeamishness* that will not allow the Title of *Doctor* to any Clergy Man; or, an insinuation that he was *not graduated Doctor in the University*. If the first be intended, 'tis but a piece of *Quakerism*, the 4th. day of the Week commonly called *Wednesday*. If the second be meant, he was not called *Doctor* until the Month of *February 1682*, when he received his Degree in the *Theological Schools of the New College at St. Andrews from the Learned Doctor Comri, then Vice-Chancellor of the University*.

Our Libeller adds that he is a mighty Agent for the Party. If he has any qualities to recommend him, that of a good Agent is none of them. And again, he is represented to be one of the *Episcopal Pamphleteers*. I do not know what he means by this, unless he charges him with publishing the *Presbyterian Inquisition*. It may be he was the Author of that *Narrative*, which he is ready to justify if ever he is fairly tryed (excepting still some Marginal Notes relating to *Mr. Rule*, to which he had no accession) and this Pamphlet contains so many steps of *Presbyterian Knavery and disingenuity*, that if he please he may let it alone.

Pag. 72. But the saddest blow against the *Doctor* is this, that it is well known that he Rode for several years in the *Pope's Guards*, but I ask, to whom is this known? *To the Presbyterians only, who know all secrets, and discover Plots in the World of the Moon?* But I must tell you that for the time the *Doctor* was

was abroad, he was never out of *France*, and the Confines of it, nor nearer to *Rome* than about four hundred and eighty *Italian Miles*. It were more easie for this Accufer to have Copied the former Libel contained in the *Presbyterian Inquisition*, than thus to trust to his own invention.

Mr. Gray comes next, if he mean Mr. *James Gray*, Minister of *Kelsø*, he is remarkable for his *Modesty*, *Learning*, *Veracity*, and *Piety*, and he is Charactered in an opposite Style, by such as neither know him, nor the vertues that recommend him to his Brethren.

Mr. *George Henry*, Minister of *Corstorphen*, is a Man of *Gravity* and *Prudence*, and his other qualifications are undeniable, and he is not capable of any such extravagance of *Passion* as this common Accufer charges him with. Pag. 78.

Mr. *Alexander Ramsay*, Minister of the *Old Kirk of Edinburgh*, was driven from his Residence in the *West* by the *Covenanted Zealots*, and lived since in the Eye of the Nation, beloved of all that know him, whether we consider his blameless *Life*, or Ministerial *Sufficiencies*.

Dr. *Annan Dean of Edinburgh* was known all *Scotland* over, and there was scarcely ever a more innocent Man in *Britain*, and he needs no Apology.

Now 'tis pleasant enough to observe, that in all this List he hath not named *the Author of Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, nor *the Publisher*.

I have

I have given you a short account of such as I know, for such as I am not acquainted with, I have no reason to believe this Libeller. For if they were never so guilty, they must have other Accusers than Men of such Prostitute Consciences. His Civility to the

* Vide Page 4. throughout.

† Printed for Tho. Anderson near Charing-Cross. 1693.

Church of * *England* alone, makes it appear how little he is to be regarded. He begins his Book with a † Lye in the *Title Page*, that it might be all of a piece. As for any Shadows of Argument that are here and there scattered, if they be of any weight they shall be considered when the other Pamphlets, that are threatned by the Party, are made publick.

Farewel.

F I N I S.



